JULY 1956

PACIFIC SCHOOL OF RELIGION

Christian News-Letter

ARAB NATIONALISM AND CHRISTIAN PATIENCE
Sir John Glubb

DO WE LIKE THE DEATH PENALTY?
Sir Walter Moberley

POLITICS OUGHT TO BE DULL
T. E. Utley

WHITHER SOUTH AFRICA?
E. H. Robertson

EDITED BY JOHN LAWRENCE

Published quarterly by
THE CHRISTIAN FRONTIER COUNCIL

CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER

Editor: John Lawrence. *Assistant Editor: Mark Gibbs.*

Vol. 4, *No.* 3 *July* 195

CONTENTS

Page

FROM THE EDITOR 1
Conduct of War; Political Warfare and Cold Warfare; Religionless Christianity; Faster and Faster; The Arabs and Ourselves; Premium Bonds.

ARAB NATIONALISM AND CHRISTIAN PATIENCE. Sir John Glubb 9

THE CHRISTIAN IN THE CIVIL SERVICE 12

"RELIGIONLESS CHRISTIANITY" 17

CHURCHES BEAR EACH OTHER'S BURDENS. Kenneth Slack ... 20

FRONTIER CHRONICLE 26

DO WE LIKE THE DEATH PENALTY? Sir Walter Moberley ... 30

POLITICS OUGHT TO BE DULL. T. E. Utley 34

WHITHER SOUTH AFRICA? E. H. Robertson 39

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR 45

BOOK REVIEWS. By John Lawrence, Muriel Telford, Margaret Tilley and E. L. Mascall 47

FOUNDATIONS OF UNITY 52

BOOKS RECEIVED ... ... *Inside Back Cover*

OUR CONTRIBUTORS ... ... *Inside Back Cover*

Subscription 10/6 *per annum. Special rate for full-time students and missionaries* 5/- *post free. Single copies available on request* 2/6 (*post free* 2/8).

Subscriptions to:
Oxley & Son (Windsor) Ltd.,
4 *High Street, Windsor.*

Editorial Correspondence:
24 *St. Leonard's Terrace,*
*London, S.W.*3.

The Christian Frontier Council, under whose auspices this journal is published, is a fellowship of 30 *or* 40 *lay men and women who hold responsible positions in secular life and have met regularly for the past eleven years to explore with each other the practical implications of their faith. They include members of all denominations. From time to time the Council forms specialised groups to deal with subjects such as politics, medicine or education. The Council does not seek publicity, but on appropriate occasions the substance of its discussions will be made known in this journal. The Editor is solely responsible for what is published in "Christian News-Letter".*

CHRISTIAN
NEWS-LETTER

From the Editor

We are to save a considerable sum on our expenditure for defence. So far, so good. But it seems that we are only enabled to do this because we rely on a small number of nuclear weapons to do the work of a vast amount of conventional armaments. This raises a moral question of the first importance which ought to dominate discussion of the defence estimates. If I say, as I do say, that the hydrogen bomb is so terrible and so undiscriminating a weapon that it should never be used, not even in retaliation, I shall be told with great assurance that all war is total war and that no limits can be placed on the weapons that belligerents will in fact use. Such assertions as these are often made in a tone which implies that they need no proof, that it is incredible that this should not be so. But do those who make these assertions realise that there is a large volume of experience against them? Have they, for instance, fully digested the facts marshalled by Professor Herbert Butterfield in *Christianity, Diplomacy and War*?

There are Christians who maintain that massive nuclear retaliation is the proper answer to aggression, even it would seem to aggression of a local and limited character. But have they considered such arguments as those put forward by the Bishop of Chichester in the pamphlet *Nuclear War and Peace* (N.P.C., 29 Great James Street, W.C.1. 2s. 6d.)? To my mind Dr. Bell has shown conclusively that the principles for conduct in war that have been generally accepted in both Catholic and Protestant tradition do apply to the hydrogen bomb and that they plainly forbid its use. But the same arguments do not necessarily apply to the tactical use of "A" weapons against front line troops, though it is clear that so terrible a weapon should only be used in case of extreme need.

This sort of moral classification rouses a strong resistance in all forms of Anglo-Saxon Christianty but sometimes we may be losers thereby. Protestants are right to protest against a legal approach to

morals. Anglo-Saxon empiricism is a valuable corrective to the habit of constructing long chains of *a priori* reasoning founded on unestablished premises, but pure empiricism may prevent the discriminating application of principle. Casuistry has earned a bad name, but not all moral theology is casuistry. When Grotius wrote on the principles of conduct which must be observed, even in war, he was drawing on a long stream of sound Christian thinking. It is to this tradition that we owe the series of international agreements which culminates in the Geneva Protocol forbidding the use of poison gas and chemical and bacteriological warfare and in the Geneva Convention on the welfare of the sick and wounded and prisoners of war. The rules laid down in this and similar declarations have, on the whole, been well kept. Our first duty, as Dr. Bell makes clear, is to work for the prevention of all war; but if we fail in this we need not despair. We must "repudiate the idea that nuclear warfare is a decree of fate". And we must not make our preparations for defence on the assumption that we are entitled to use a few hydrogen bombs in place of many regiments of tanks.

Political Warfare and Cold Warfare

In war every Government does with its left hand things that it would be awkward to admit publicly. In the last war I was personally concerned with open propaganda. In this field the policy was to tell the truth, on the principle that honesty was the best policy. I was never asked to publish anything that the British Government did not believe to be true at the time, but it was widely supposed among people who ought to have known that the Government had other agencies, which used other methods and did not shrink from the wholesale dissemination of falsehood when that seemed to be advantageous to the Allied cause. Personally I am not inclined to be squeamish in this matter. The line must be drawn somewhere; but political warfare takes many forms and if one is prepared to admit, as I am, that a country is sometimes justified in fighting a war, it seems to follow that some kinds of political warfare are legitimate even if others are barred. It is a very different thing to carry on political warfare in time of peace. The cold war has been through phases when it would have been unrealistic to expect the Governments involved in it not to try to undermine each other's regimes in preparation for what might well have become a shooting war. And it seems more than likely that our Government, among others, did make such preparations. But times have changed, the cold war (if that phrase is still suitable) does not now

eem likely to become a shooting war. It is time that we stopped olitical warfare against the Communist countries. Open and truthful ropaganda can do all that is now legitimate. So one is bound to ask ie question whether, and by what means, our Government is still arrying on political warfare against Russia and other Communist ountries? In the nature of the case no official answer can be given. ut official action can be taken.

Religionless Christianity

We publish on another page a report of a discussion on some of ietrich Bonnhoeffer's concepts, which took place in the Christian rontier Council recently. The speakers' names are not, as a rule, iven because it seems fairer to preserve the anonymity of remarks iade on the spur of the moment in the course of a private discussion, ut Pastor Eberhardt Bethge has kindly allowed his name to be used. astor Bethge was one of Bonnhoeffer's closest friends, he is related o him by marriage and he is the editor of his literary remains.

Much of the discussion turned on Bonnhoeffer's use of the phrase Religionless Christianity". Perhaps it will never be known just what iese letters to Dr. Bethge, smuggled out of prison during the last ionths of Bonnhoeffer's life, intended to convey. One thing at least clear. By "religionless Christianity" Bonnhoeffer did not mean nurchless Christianity. The whole course of his life is the guarantee of iat. What, then, did he mean? A friend suggests the following ucidation. A religion is always something which a culture throws up . . . a complex of rites, ceremonies, customs and institutions designed o hold the culture together by making alive and keeping alive the erception of those truths" on which the culture is based. "Faith is the omplex of truths thus acknowledged. . . . It may—and usually will—xpress itself through some 'religious' integument. But this 'religious' tegument, being an element of culture, is liable to the natural laws of rowth, maturity and decay, and will at some moments be an ill-tting vesture which does not really express the truths (i.e. Faith) and ust be adapted or discarded. . . . Bonnhoeffer is saying that however ell the Faith is incarnate in a religion, it must never be absolutely entified with it. Cultures are gifts of God to be used by the Faith, ut woe to the Faith which is only expressive of culture and not itical of it too." In principle this is important for Christianity at all mes, but in practice it is particularly important to-day "when the aith is ill-served by its inherited religion. Good Friday is at hand;

this body must be laid aside that a better may be put on. N.B. the better will not be wholly new but both new and old."

If this general interpretation is correct, one might say that for the first two, or perhaps three centuries of its existence the Christian faith was not yet embodied in a religion. This is not to deny the value of the "religious" forms which the Christian faith took on during the succeeding centuries but it is a warning not to confuse the "religious" expression with the faith itself. The tension between the Christian faith and its expression in a "religious" system is a fact which must be accepted. But the acceptance does not invalidate any view of the Church which you may hold. The chief cause of the great schism between East and West was that both Greeks and Latins took their "religion" for their faith and did not realize that a common faith underlay "religious" differences. Looking at our present differences it is almost true, but alas! not quite true, that there are many religions in Christendom but only one faith.

Faster and Faster

Is there really more to be done now than in the days when Mr. Gladstone could spend six months of the year in rural retirement at Hawarden, leaving the other six months for politics? And if not, why are most of us in a perpetual rush, and why are there so many nervous breakdowns which seem to be due to overwork? The day still has twenty-four hours but there seems to be less time than there was forty years ago.

Before the days of shorthand-typists there was a strict limit to the number of letters that one man could write. Before the days of the internal combustion engine and the underground railway there was a strict limit to the number of committees that one man could attend. Without duplicating machines no writing could be multiplied unless it was felt to be worth printing. Without aeroplanes it was not easy to attend many international conferences in the course of a lifetime; without trains it was not possible to do so. If people in the eighteenth century or the thirteenth century had been able to spend a great part of their time rushing about to meet each other and ringing each other up on the telephone they would doubtless have done so. Charles V and the Fuggers, Oliver Cromwell and Sir Thomas Gresham would have made effective use of modern communications. Our inventions make it possible to get more done in the course of a year; but they do not remove the inherent limits of human capacity. By making it possible to do more they tempt us to attempt too much.

The temptation can be subtle. If I am always busy, does it not show y importance? I am tempted to build up a picture of myself as the dispensable person who has no free time and I may minister to that cture by deliberately filling every minute of the day until I have no ne for self recollection. So my fantastic image of myself tends to de my real self from me, though probably not from my acquaintances.

My conceit tells me that I do things better than others do, so I try do too much myself, although others are waiting to help me, if I ll let them. Indeed there are many retired people and others whose ergies are not fully used; the failure to give such people constructive rk both puts them in a wrong position and at the same time puts o much burden on a few busy bodies. Nevertheless the determination live up to my idea of myself drives me to ever greater exertions ich end in a nervous breakdown. To use the language of modern ychology, the discrepancy between the "neurotic self" and the real f produces a neurosis. To use the language of popular wisdom, spired in this case by sound theology, pride leads to a fall.

All the social pressure is on the side of rush. A man who is always sy receives uncritical esteem for his busyness, even if he is unpopular r his bad temper and his conceit. A man who takes life in a leisurely y is suspected of not pulling his weight. Religious people remember at the Bible tells us to use our talents but they forget that the servant th five talents was not expected to earn so much as the servant with . I am to play my part as well as I can but it will be a small part. hoever I am, I ought not to allow pride to induce me to attempt more an my powers permit.

To be over busy is nothing new. Chaucer wrote of his merchant:

"In all the world no busier man there was
And yet he seemed busier than he was."

wadays the temptation is greater, but society has not yet found a tection against over-busyness. The Church ought to show us how to establish the rhythm of our lives so that we are occupied without ng rushed. But some of the clergy, and some of the "professional men", such as myself, are among the worst offenders. It is true that re are some clergy, and some lay people, who seem to have found the wer, if one may judge from their lives. But for the most part even y do not tell us what the answer is.

Not long ago I had to address a fairly typical group of clergy. All one had bicycles or mechanical transport. I found myself saying

to one of them that a motor bicycle must be a necessity for his job Then one who had remained silent said quietly "I have the larges parish in this area but I walk everywhere. When they see me walking people have time to come and talk to me; if I went by on a bicycle o in a car I should miss all that." I do not know what committees tha clergyman left unattended or what periodicals unread but it seemed t me that he was doing his job.

When the Church begins to look seriously for remedies against rush they will be found and it is a reasonable guess that these remedies wil be traditional in essence but new in form. The special rhythm of worl and prayer worked out by St. Benedict cannot be applied as it stand to the needs of lay people to-day but its equivalent must be found. Th ideal of an English gentleman has become old fashioned but it embodie a healthy rhythm of work, recreation and public service, or so I wa brought up to believe. To-day we need a "Busy Man's Rule of Life"

In the meantime the continual improvement of communication increases the temptation to over busyness with every year that passes It is true that all these inventions ought to be used but does it follo that they should all be used at once and as soon as they are invented Might it not be wise to be sparing in our use of electronic computer and aeroplanes until we see more clearly what these inventions ar doing to our innermost natures? Television is an excellent thing i itself. But was it wise to launch out on the development of TV befor our culture has fully digested the cinema and the radio?

The Arabs and Ourselves

At a time when European influence on the Arab world is bein challenged, it is pleasant to reflect on the benefits which the West ha conferred on the Arabs. They are real benefits. But it is more importan to reflect on the injuries which we have done to them, or what is equall important, on the injuries which the Arabs conceive us to have done

The first great wrong that Europe did to the Near East was the failur of Latin and Greek Christianity to incorporate the spirit of Semiti Christianity into itself. In the early Church all held the same faith but the faith was clothed in a different national dress in Greece or Italy in Syria or Egypt or North Africa, or in the Persian Empire. Th difference between national branches of the Church was a difference o "religion" in the sense in which Bonnhoeffer uses the word, but in n case was it a difference in faith until the disputes of the fourth and fift

nturies. Some scholars would say that even then there was more tionalism than theology in the schisms which took the greater part Semitic Christianity outside the main stream of the Church. Cer-nly the spiritual descendants of the "Nestorians" and "Mono-ysites" often fail to hold the doctrines for which they were anathe-atised by Rome and Greece. Personally I suspect that all the bsequent divisions of Christianity flow from the failure of Greek and mite to live together in the same Church. A sustained effort to derstand the ways of thought of people whose thinking was nearer the Old Testament than to Aristotle and Plato might or might not ve held the Church together; it would surely have enriched the reek and Latin Christianity from which we are ourselves descended. t no such effort was made and before long the provinces of the East und in Islam a deliverance from an uncomprehending Greece.

The second great wrong that Europe has inflicted on the Arabs the Crusades, or so at least the Arabs think. The Crusades were ble in conception but they were mistaken in method—to use no onger word. The short lived Crusader kingdoms were artificial eations that could not last. But to the Arabs they seem like a gged barb which was thrust into their flesh. There are French Roman atholics who do yearly penance for the massacre of St. Bartholomew's ay. Where are the Western Europeans who will do penance for the assacre carried out by the Crusaders at the capture of Jerusalem? To all Arabs the establishment of the state of Israel seems a wrong the same kind as the Crusades. Once more the "Franks" have rust an intrusive body into the Arab world. Hundreds of thousands Arabs have lost their homes, their livelihood and everything that ves a man self-respect. To give persecuted Jews a home in our vn country was a work of charity. To encourage them to go to lestine was to shuffle off the burden and to place it upon the Arabs. worked with the German Jewish Aid Committee at the worst time Hitler's persecution of the Jews and I do not forget what the Jews ve suffered at the hands of West European Gentiles but I think that y help which we gave to the Jews should have been given at our own pense, not at the expense of the Arabs. To them it seems that the te of Israel was established partly by fraud, partly by violence, at stages with Western connivance and sometimes with active Western pport. Every Western power that operates in the Near East must pect to receive part of the odium for this. The Arab view of these tters is not the whole truth but it contains enough truth to deserve re consideration than is sometimes given to it.

Premium Bonds

Some of my friends have taken me to task for supporting the scheme for premium bonds at the last meeting of the British Council of Churches and then on the air. But I have found at least as much support as opposition.

I stand by what I said in April. I am unable to see that gambling is wrong in principle, though I agree that excessive gambling is a fearful evil. If you buy premium bonds you are not risking your capital. You are gambling with your 4 per cent chance of drawing lucky. In other words the transaction consists of four parts of gambling to 100 parts of saving. I believe that such a small element of gambling is negligible from a moral point of view, and I would ask those who differ from me to weigh any evil which they may discern in the premium bonds against the moral duty of every government to maintain the value of money. If the issue of premium bonds can draw off fresh money into savings, it will help to halt creeping inflation which is one of the characteristic evils of our age.

The issue of premium bonds is an attempt to make a healthy and imaginative use of the gambling instinct. The pools are an unhealthy form of gambling, for two reasons. They tempt people to stake more than they can afford and they offer prizes so great as to alter the whole way of life of the winners. One thousand pounds is scarcely more than enough to pay the deposit on a house and I am prepared to accept the argument that a prize of £1000 is exciting without being corrupting. But prizes of £10,000 and more are enough to make the winners think they are richer than they are. So I would like to see a heavy and progressive tax on gambling gains of over about £2000, or alternatively a legal limit on winnings, such as some countries already impose. I realize that neither proposal is quite so simple as it looks. If there are difficulties, I would like to see a resolute effort to overcome them.

J. W. L.

Frontier Luncheon

The next Frontier Luncheon will be on 13th November, when Miss Violet Markham, C.H., will speak on "Technicians or Whole Human Beings".

Arab Nationalism and Christian Patience

Sir John Glubb

As churchwarden of the Anglican Church in Amman, Glubb Pasha bore notable witness to his faith. The following article is the substance of an address given in the Church of St. Stephen, Walbrook, London, under the auspices of the National Peace Council.

Nationalism has been called the curse of our age, and the description may well be apt. For nationalism is patriotism gone wrong. In the same way, jealousy is the negative aspect of ambition or the desire for honour. Perhaps ambition is not in itself a Christian virtue, but at least it is a positive factor. It can and does inspire men to work, to build up, to act. Jealousy is the negative side of the same quality. It causes us to hate those who are more successful than ourselves. Instead of inspiring men to constructive efforts, as ambition does, it drives them to a negative attitude, to hatred, to the desire to do injury to others.

Now I assume that nationalism stands to patriotism in the same relation as jealousy does to ambition. Patriotism inspires men to serve their country and to bear hardship and make sacrifices for love of the people and the land to which they belong. Patriotism is thus a positive asset, a quality inspired by love. But nationalism is patriotism gone sour. It teaches people to hate foreigners, to dislike all other countries and to seek to insult, injure or destroy other human beings, solely because they belong to a nation other than their own. Thus nationalism is a negative factor, a quality of hatred. But when we consider our relations to the people of Asia, we must not make the error of complacently putting all the blame on them. We must ask ourselves why their patriotism is sour, why it gives place to xenophobia. We must ask ourselves whether any blame falls on us.

I think that wherever Britain has attained any influence in Asia, she has materially benefited the country concerned. She has brought prosperity, public security, impartial justice, public works and an efficient civil service. But in one way, we have been supercilious.

This exclusiveness, this conceit, may be a negative fault, a sin of omission. We did not consciously mean harm, but we omitted that Christian charity which should have made us appreciate that our attitude often caused pain. We showed a lack of consideration for other

people's feelings. Such spiritual wounds rankle more deeply than if we had been physically brutal, but had treated other people as social equals.

In the case of the Arabs, also, we were guilty of another error. There can be no doubt that we made them certain promises during the First World War, which we did not subsequently carry out. We have given the Arabs much help since 1918, but the fact that you help a man provokes no gratitude if the help you actually give falls short of the help you promised.

One of the things which struck me most forcibly in recent years, is that the after effects of political errors or immorality last for so long a time. Political dishonesty indeed vents itself upon the fathers and upon the children, unto the third and fourth generation.

There is also another way in which we can regard these troubles. I often find it instructive to compare the lives of nations to the lives of individuals. Using such a simile, we may think of all these Arab Governments as our children. We gave them birth in the First World War. We all know how charming children are for their first few years, and how often they then become disobedient and rebellious. But the wise parent will realize that these tantrums are a dispensation of Providence. The child must and should break away from its parents and learn to face the world alone. If the situation is handled with sympathy and wisdom, no permanent injury will result, and when our children are men and women in the world they will forget their adolescent rebellions and still look back to us as home, and as a refuge to which they can resort when in trouble or perplexity. When eastern peoples seem to us difficult and resentful, we may well remember that we are responsible for their upbringing. As they grow older, they also want to control their own affairs.

What now should be our attitude? Let us consider it first from the personal angle. Should we resent and fight back or should we turn the other cheek? Many people will say that you cannot turn the other cheek in the modern world. If you do, people will descend upon you like beasts of prey and tear you limb from limb. The only course to follow is to hit back—quick and hard.

But people who speak like this do not appreciate the fact that by turning the other cheek, you often change the other man. He does not take advantage of your action to hit again. It is quite possible indeed that he will apologize. And even if he does not, it often happens that the bystanders will come to you later, and thank you for setting them such an example of patience and courage.

When I went to Trans-Jordan, twenty-six years ago, there was onstant raiding and fighting across the border between Trans-Jordan nd Saudi Arabia. Both governments publicly stated their readiness o take action against the raiders, but neither did so. This was because either side trusted the good faith of the other. Each government aited for the other to prove its good intentions by taking action. eriodically, representatives of the two governments met, ostensibly o arrange restitution of the looted property and livestock. Both sides rought long lists of claims, which the other side rejected as false. uch meetings only made relations more exacerbated, and no loot as ever returned.

One day I was told that I was to be the Jordan representative at ie next meeting with the Saudi Arabians. I decided to try new ctics. The Saudi Arabian representative arrived at the meeting look- g rather aggressive and carrying enormously long lists of claims, hich he wanted discussed. I replied that I was new to such matters nd that I would take his word for their accuracy, if he guaranteed iem, for I knew him to be a man of honour. He was taken aback, nd eventually said that he could not agree. I pleaded my ignorance nd begged him to tell me the right answer. Soon we had changed des. Instead of wrangling about each other's claims, each of us was sisting that he would accept the decision of the other. We were soon eat friends. There was never any more frontier raiding.

Sometimes I have wondered whether this affair was not another ustration of the Sermon on the Mount. If a man would take your oat, offer him your cloak also. Most people of course would say At that rate, you would soon have no clothes at all". But would is be so? Perhaps when you offered your cloak, he would regret s bad manners, and give you back your coat.

Affairs of state are more difficult to legislate for than is personal onduct. But I imagine that similar considerations prevail there so. Please do not misunderstand me. I do not mean that we should e weak. On the contrary, a Christian policy requires constant rmness and a courage of steel. It may even lead you to war. But hat I mean is that our policy should never be inspired by hatred, alousy or revenge. Policy decisions should always be taken after lm consideration of what is right and what is best for the public ood. Perhaps my intention would be clearer if I said that the motive the touchstone of our decision.

When I have felt resentful myself, I have often repeated to myself the rse, "And the Lord said unto Jonah—Doest thou well to be angry?"

Of course people will tell you that the Sermon on the Mount is jus idealism—it cannot be applied in the world to-day. Nowadays, the say, nations have to fight and struggle and intrigue in order to liv —or rather "to raise their standard of living". This, of course, mean their physical standard of living—eating and drinking, and havin cars, radios and refrigerators. But we have a verse which answers tha also: "Seek ye first the Kingdom of God and His righteousness—an all these things shall be added unto you."

The Christian in The Civil Service

(By a member of a Frontier Group of Civil Servants)

Two kinds of question may be asked about the administrativ civil service as a career for the Christian. Some, regarding the civ service as a vast soulless machine, may wonder whether it is suitable sphere for a conscientious Christian to enter if he wants t promote the purposes of a loving God. And Christians inside the civ service may wonder whether there is any distinctive way in whic they ought to be doing their work. Is there a Christian way o drafting letters, minuting files, conducting interviews, and writin reports? Does a Christian show his religion simply in the manne of his personal relations with his colleagues and the public? O does his faith affect the decisions he takes and the policies h recommends?

These questions really depend upon the answer to another question What place, if any, does secular government occupy in God's pur pose for the world? The author has neither the space nor the theo logical equipment to discuss this subject, especially as little help i to be had from Protestant thought during the last three hundre years; during this time the emphasis has all been on God's spiritua purposes in redemption, which have not been regarded as promotable by secular power. Some theological assumptions must, however underlie any treatment of the Christian life in the service of govern ment, and in what follows it will be assumed that the object of secula government in God's purpose is to assist God's rule of the world by securing, through compulsion, external compliance with His will

o that there may be maintained on earth at least a rudimentary orm of the ideal society, however far men's hearts may be from him. The Church's business is with the remaking of men from within, the State's with the shaping of society from without, and both in the direction of the single ultimate purpose of God to unite men to each other in love and to Himself in grateful obedience.

In Britain the civil service is one of the organs through which civil government is carried out. The main responsibility for the overnment of the country rests with the Cabinet, the function of arliament being to test the proposals of the Cabinet against public pinion and to give or withhold approval in broad outline. The etails are left to be carried out either by the judiciary or by the ivil service. Judicial procedure is appropriate where all cases have o be treated according to known and inflexible principles, while dministrative procedure is more appropriate where considerations f public policy are prominent or where flexibility in the treatment f individual cases is important. That is why the Courts are not iven such tasks as varying speed limits or awarding national ssistance or naturalizing aliens.

It follows from this that the civil service has a great variety of nctions to perform and has become by long experience a body of xperts in what is practicable in the way of securing compliance ith the wishes of the Cabinet and Parliament. It has two main nctions:

> The first is to advise Ministers on the framing of policy, especially from the point of view of practicability;
> and the second is to ensure that Government policy is executed as efficiently as possible.

he first of these tasks falls chiefly on the higher ranks of the ervice, though even at quite low levels fresh questions of policy rise, and it is the duty of all ranks of the service to be on the look-ut for ways in which the work of the Department can be made nore efficient. In the carrying out of some routine operation it may ppear that the time of a clerk could be saved if the public were equired to answer an additional question on a form, but the sking of the question may give rise to complaints and the decision hether it is worth asking may have to be taken at quite a high evel.

What is the answer to the questions put at the beginning of this rticle? One of these questions was whether the Christian civil ervant ought to be in some way different from his colleagues.

The answer seems to be that perhaps he will be, or perhaps the difference will not be obvious, but at all events he ought not to try to be different, for both he and his colleagues are engaged on the same task, viz. the translation into practical terms of governmental measures to promote obedience to God's will. The only difference at the outset is that the Christian has, or should have, a better appreciation of what civil government is really intended for. The right question for the Christian to ask, therefore, is not "How can I show my Christianity in a distinctive way?" but "How can the civil service, and I in my position in it, best fulfil the tasks which God has laid upon it?" This can be considered under the two headings mentioned before—(a) the framing of policy, and (b) its execution.

The formation of policy is sometimes thought to consist in the discovery of a good principle and its practical application to some aspect of the nation's life. This is rarely if ever the case. It is only the amateur, the propagandist, and the axe-grinder who demand that a Government Department shall have only one idea. Nearly every policy emerges from a balance of several conflicting principles, all of them good. For instance, the Home Office in administering services such as the police or fire brigades, has to weigh up the claims of efficiency, local autonomy, and public economy; the Treasury has to weigh the desirability of giving greater freedom to industry against the need for financial control in the interest of national prosperity and so of industry itself; the Ministry of National Insurance has to run a vast machine well and economically and yet in such a way as to give impartial decisions without loss of sympathy and imagination in individual cases. Every Department has its own peculiar tangle of conflicting claims among which it has to steer the best course it can.

In this task of helping to shape a policy out of conflicting claims and principles the Christian civil servant ought to remember that all civil government serves God's ends. The civil servant who fails to do this is under constant danger of being swayed too much by considerations of temporary expediency. On the other hand the Christian civil servant is often in the opposite danger of attaching so much importance to some principle which he has learned from his faith (and which the world perhaps tends to neglect) that he fails to give due weight to the other claims which must be balanced against it. An earnest Christian could, for instance, become so fanatically impressed with the sacredness of human life that in

dministering legislation relating to safety on roads or in factories e paid insufficient regard to the less obviously Christian claims of ndustrial efficiency or public economy. There is probably no prin-iple, however Christian in appearance, that can be pushed to the ltimate.* Take, for instance, the question of truth. The civil ervant has to keep confidences and safeguard national security: ius while he probably never need tell a lie he must often exercise conomy of truth in answer to improper requests for information. he Christian civil servant should not keep looking back over his houlder to find directives from the Bible or the Church which he an automatically apply to any situation; rather he ought to be onstantly looking forward to the goal which God has set, and, in mitation of God's methods disclosed in the Bible and in history, se all possible means to bring society nearer to that goal. The pecial temptations of the Christian are to form an incomplete icture of God's ideal and to be too squeamish about the means o be used to promote it; the special temptation of the non-Christian to become so expert in the use of means that he forgets the goal ltogether. The fact that some Christians in the civil service succumb o their special temptations results in other civil servants thinking nat they cannot become good Christians without ceasing to be good vil servants. Conversely the fact that some non-Christians who are eputed to be good civil servants succumb to the special temptation the non-Christian result in some Christians thinking they can ever be good civil servants. If all Christians thought like that, civil overnment would be handed over entirely to those who fail to cknowledge the Christian revelation.

In the day-to-day work of converting policy into action a special esponsibility rests upon the Christian to remember three things:

Firstly, the other government institutions with which he has to eal—whether Parliament, or the Courts, or other government depart-ens, or local authorities—are engaged together with his Depart-ent in a common enterprise, and are therefore to be regarded as llies rather than as enemies. (In an evil world the civil servant may ften find himself in conflict with some other government institution, nd the fact that he must regard such conflict as unnatural must ot prevent him from fighting hard when necessary.)

Secondly, the people with whom he deals, including his own col-

* This was written without knowledge of Dietrich Bonhoeffer's *Ethics* or the notice of it on p. 160 of the CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER for October, 1955.

leagues and subordinates, are all among those for whom Chris died, and who each have their place in the purposes of God, and are therefore to be respected as individuals and not treated as tool or counters although the nature of some individuals, the exigencie of public economy and shortage of staff, and even the requirement of even-handed justice, may make it necessary to treat some peopl in an apparently cold and formal manner.

Lastly, the civil servant, just as much as the judge, is an executo of God's justice both towards claimants for benefits from the govern ment and between conflicting interests with which his Departmen has to deal; therefore all such claims must be dealt with in th spirit of Christian love and without vindictiveness or partiality o that perfunctory treatment that is so tempting to the possessor o power. (It may not be possible to ensure that everyone receives per fect justice: there may have to be a choice beween rough justice fo all and perfect justice for the few.)

A further responsibility rests upon the Christian civil servan throughout his work. The Christian, with his spiritual knowledge o the human heart, should be specially alive to those temptations and vices to which the civil service in general, and his own Departmen in particular, is prone. This is not easy, even for the Christian, for h knows his work only from inside and may be blind to its short comings or even regard them as virtues.

Discussion with Christian critics from outside the civil service suggests that the special temptations of the civil servant arise from his possession of three things—power, personal security, and technical efficiency. From his possession of power over the lives of others comes the temptation to treat the public in an off-hand, impersonal way, to neglect to take others into his confidence, to refuse to delegate responsibility, and to force the public into the departmental mould. His possession of personal security, while it frees him from temptations to corrupt dealing, exposes him to the dangers of laziness and lack of initiative. His possession of an administrative or executive technique of wonderful efficiency tempts him to an undue pride in that technique, so that he becomes resistant to new methods and ideas: if any problem arises that the technique cannot solve, the problem must be proved to be unreal or unimportant; and if a member of the public has a problem that the civil service machine cannot cope with, so much the worse for the person.

There are also special vices peculiar to particular Departments. ach Department in the course of time develops a philosophy of its wn, which only the strongest of Ministers can do anything to change. his philosophy is both the strength and weakness of the Department, nd the administrative civil servants need to be continually on the atch for the points at which the Departmental philosophy is being ushed beyond what is reasonable. Great courage may be required a Christian to suggest to his superiors that they are overdoing their nerished principles. (See letter on Page 46—*Editor.*)

"Religionless Christianity"

eport of a discussion on Dietrich Bonhoeffer's "Letters and Papers from Prison" at a recent meeting of the Christian Frontier Council.

Publication in the CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER *does not necessarily imply at the views expressed are those of the Editor; still less that they are ose of the Christian Frontier Council; I believe in fact that if some of e views expressed in the following paragraphs are generally accepted, ey would destroy the kernel of the Christian faith and not only its husk "religion". But the matters raised are important, and we believe that report of this discussion will help our readers to sift the wheat from the aff.* *J. W. L.*

"A", who introduced the discussion, said that he would concentrate n "religionless Christianity", which was the most important idea in e book, though it was also the most difficult. At this stage, however, was something which could only be whispered about in upper rooms.

The question Bonhoeffer asked was: "How can we reclaim for hrist a world which has come of age?" and to this question he gave e answer: "By religionless Christianity". To most people this emed paradoxical, but there were those, e.g. Frederick Denison laurice, Karl Barth and others, who had spoken of religion as a bad ing; by religion meaning a great system of thought and cultus which en built up and in which they felt secure; something which the living od could not break through. But Bonhoeffer went further than that: y religion he appeared to mean that kind of Christianity which oked for God and could only find him in the interstices of nature, the gaps which could not be explained. Religionless Christianity

meant a Christianity which would find God in the whole world, in ou real experience everywhere. He must be found "in life, and not onl in death; in health and vigour, and not only in suffering; in activit and not only in sin".

Bonhoeffer would say that the faith of the Bible was not a religion but that it had been turned into a religion very early on; and especiall since the Reformation and the Renaissance the tendency had been t make it something separate from the world, concentrating on individu salvation from frustrations and sins, whereas faith in the Bible sens was coming to live in a world which had been renewed in Chris "A" agreed with Bonhoeffer's view that we needed first to absorb wha the Old Testament taught about God and the world and His purpose instead of going straight into the New Testament and interpreting it i the light of our religious conceptions.

Bonhoeffer held that it was an archaism to try to maintain Christianit as a religion; there was fresh air in this idea and Christians shoul want to know more about it. "A" himself wanted to see Christian maintaining a reticence when speaking of their faith and of God, an practising a secret discipline. He thought that in the long run thi would excite people's interest far more than evangelistic campaigns etc. Bonhoeffer said that we had got to get alongside our fellow me and share their life, rather than seeking to draw them out of it and mak them "religious".

How did this affect our attitude to the Churches, which were in fac religious organizations? "A" thought the answer was to remain in th Churches but to sit very loosely to existing church forms, waiting fo this new thing to come to birth.

Lastly, if being a Christian had to become meaningful in the lif of the world, this might be a Frontier task. One should not concentrat on Bonhoeffer and his German background but explore the idea in a English context. Ronald Gregor Smith in his book *The New Ma* was the only British person who had so far had the courage to tackl the problem, but his book, while very interesting, was also extremel obscure. Possibly Blake was an archetype of religionless Christianity born out of due time, but others were needed.

Pastor Bethge described how he had received a number of letter from Bonhoeffer but had not realised how valuable they were until after they were published. Some later ones had had to be destroyed for security reasons. One must remember that these were letters, not carefully thought out papers intended for publication, and therefore the meaning was not always very clear. Now the published letters

re being much discussed in Germany and in these discussions certain ints had to be emphasized:

(1) This belief of Bonhoeffer's was completely centred on Jesus Christ and was in no way a step towards modernism or liberalism. So the religionless interpretation of Christianity must be a Christological interpretation.

(2) Bonhoeffer was always interested in concrete situations and the realities of the day. So the religionless interpretation must be a concrete interpretation.

(3) Bonhoeffer regarded the secularisation of the Western world positively, as a fruit of Christianity. He says that we are now coming to an age where the withering away of religion is a good thing and not a bad thing. He is like Boniface when he came to Germany and cut down Thor's Oak. He is to-day cutting down the religious oaks and we are discovering that it is a wonderful thing to be freed and that in these coming years we may be able to live with Jesus Christ in quite a new way.

(4) Bonhoeffer himself used the religion of the Church, but he said that religion had become only a province of our lives, and it was a blasphemy to make Jesus Christ only a part: he is our whole life. Religion in the bad sense was based on the idea of the *Deus ex machina*, a hope that all our needs would be met, whereas the essence of Christianity was that Christians were on the same side as the God who conquers by his weakness.

Pastor Bethge suggested that perhaps Bonhoeffer's ideas were mmed up best in the poem on pages 167-8, "Christians and Unlievers":

Men go to God when they are sore bestead,
Pray to him for succour, for his peace, for bread,
For mercy for them sick, sinning or dead:
All men do so, Christian and unbelieving.

Men go to God when he is sore bestead,
Find *him* poor and scorned, without shelter or bread,
Whelmed under weight of the wicked, the weak, the dead:
Christians stand by God in his hour of grieving.

God goeth to every man when sore bestead,
Feedeth body and spirit with his bread,
For Christians, heathens, alike he hangeth dead:
And both alike forgiving.

In the general discussion, "B" suggested that it would be dangerous presume that God was only in what we knew; he was also in what did not know. As regards the Church, although Abraham and oses and Christ himself had been against the Church of their day, s there not a difference with the Church which Christ founded? though there would not be a church in heaven, we had not got there : and he believed there was still a use for the Church.

"C" and "D" both pointed out that, although they felt rebellious ainst the Church, it was the Church which provided the sacraments. "" thought that "religion" might be safely jettisoned within the circle

of Christians, but probably not when approaching the outside wor and that the Church would be reformed by people coming in fr outside with a different attitude. At present we were in a false positi because the Church was not a true Church—a "congregation of faith men".

"E" agreed that the really live and consecrated people were frequen outside the Church, whereas those within were "pale grey".

"F" pointed out that Bonhoeffer's work must not be regarded complete. At no point did he say there was no need for the Chur but he had not had time to formulate his idea of a Christian communi

"G" suggested we should start at the other end, with the wo in which we lived and which God in Christ was seeking to reconc to himself: the world of full employment, of politics, etc. How w we, outside our work in the Church, to play our part as Christian

"H" said that there were really two "frontiers", the frontier betwe the Church and the world, which we are constantly talking abo and also a "frontier" within the Church—the frontier witness of peo who are trying to split the Church open to different ideas. Had taken that particular frontier seriously enough?

Churches Bear Each Other's Burdens

KENNETH SLACK

The speaker to popular audiences on the ecumenical moveme constantly invokes the blessed date 1910. He expatiates on the orig of the movement in the missionary enterprise culminating in the Wor Missionary Conference at Edinburgh that year. The reference perhaps garnished with a telling quotation from William Temple enthronement sermon. Then he plunges into the dense jungle Life and Work, Faith and Order and the rest and eventually emerg faint yet triumphant at Amsterdam 1948 with the World Council Churches gathering all together. Then comes the awkward mome when he has to explain that it is not quite as simple as that, but that t International Missionary Council, the "I.M.C.", which emerged fro 1910 still exists alongside the World Council "in association with" He may make a feeble attempt to explain why, carefully distinguishi between a council of churches and a council made up of nation Christian councils, but the glazed look of incomprehension in the ey of his audience will soon cause that to flicker out.

Only those in some degree engaged in the work of the ecumenical movement can appreciate the historical, practical and expedient reasons for the maintaining of the two separate organisations. The incomprehension of the wayfaring Christian has at least this justification—that what God is plainly joining together man had better not keep too long asunder. The 1955 meetings of the working committees of departments and divisions and of the Central Committee of the World Council at Davos made this plain. There may be justification for a long courtship between the ecumenical couple, but it must not remain a platonic friendship.

At Davos it was shown clearly that the logic of the World Council's thought and planning was driving it into closer and closer partnership with the International Missionary Council. At Evanston the work of Inter-Church Aid and Service to Refugees was declared to be a permanent obligation resting upon the Churches acting together. What had been thought of in a ready post-war optimism as a temporary phase of mopping up (Christian Reconstruction in Europe, as we called it in this country) was now seen to be something much more demanding. Indeed it is a warfare from which there is no discharge. Nor is this just because the post-war era has proved turbulent and disruptive. True, political action of one sort and another has caused the number of refugees to grow rather than to diminish within those years. Again natural catastrophes such as the Dutch floods, or the Ionian earthquakes, have made havoc of the Church. But something bigger has come to be involved. It was rather like the origin of that oldest of British ecumenical organs, the Bible Society, when Joseph Hughes, the Baptist Pastor from Battersea, at the meeting with Thomas Charles of Bala and some others to talk over the provision of Bibles for the Principality, was moved by the Holy Spirit of God to cry, "If for Wales, why not for the Kingdom; why not for the whole world?"

If there was cause for the Christian Churches to help one another across the barriers of confession and nationality in flood or earthquake, rioting or famine, was there any less cause when the need was permanent? It may be natural that some terrible disaster suddenly striking the life of a Church should evoke more quickly the response of the household of faith; but is it defensible that we should be unimaginative enough not to be touched with the "chronic emergency" of many of the Churches in Africa and Asia? The question admits of only one answer. The Evanston Assembly gave that answer and the Davos meetings of the Central Committee of the W.C.C. sought to implement it in action.

Dr. Robert Mackie, the retiring Director of the Division of Inter-

Church Aid and Chairman-designate of the same Division, has sai to the Central Committee of the W.C.C.:

> The way in which the mission has given place to the Church in recen years . . . is a rapid process which is happening almost everywhere. An it is a process which springs from the vision of missionary and church leaders But the result is that increasingly there are numbers of small minority churche standing by themselves in non-Christian environments . . .
>
> These facts indicate the kind of burdens which the Churches of Asia an Africa are facing to-day. There is, first, their burden of independence, an of diminishing resources. And there is, secondly, the burden of a wholl new political and social situation. This revolutionary situation is movin with extreme rapidity and Churches which were founded in a wholly other da are caught unprepared to meet it. And a further open question is how fa the presence of the West in relation to these Churches may help or hinder But there are certainly burdens to be shared . . . And in our World Counci there has grown up a will to bear one another's burdens. That is a nev factor in Christian history.
>
> Great emphasis must be placed upon this last point—that in the Worl Council of Churches there is a fellowship, and fellowship means carrying one another's burdens.

In fact the simple demands of this fellowship had already taken th action of Inter-Church Aid out far beyond Europe. Korea, Malaya and Kenya can testify to that. Now, however, a deliberate decisio has been taken to embark on a new policy of systematic help in whic Asia and Africa will loom very large and the closest co-operation wit the I.M.C. will be essential. Already at St. Albans in October there has been a small conference of the I.M.C. and the Inter-Church Aid Division leaders in order to work out some of the implications of this decision. Those called to this work of planning need our prayers as much as any one working within the ecumenical movement.

There is, to put it plainly, a most patent risk of *naiveté* here (though it is certainly not found in men like Robert Mackie). Those who have been carrying the burden and heat of the day in the missionary societies may smile a little wryly as some good Christian folk discover situations that have been the commonplace of missionary knowledge for decades. There is the simple fact that for some time much missionary work has been simply Inter-Church Aid. The day when the missionary dominated the scene and ruled with a wise paternal sway has been over for some time in most areas. Missionaries go out as invited "fraterna workers" to the younger Churches. Once there they may find themselves working under the superintendence of a national with perhaps poore professional qualifications than themselves. The Church has increased and the mission decreased, as is right.

Again, it is becoming fashionable in some circles to talk darkly of "the conservatism of the missionary societies". No doubt there is some truth in the accusation. As Dr. Mackie remarked, "mission boards are naturally cautious as they see this new response to human need developing". Missionary societies that have had a long record of struggle to raise funds to meet the needs that pressed in on them from the fields, may indeed look with caution upon a new competitor for Christian benevolence, and upon too radical a change in the technique and presentation by which the fount of generosity has been tapped in the past. Yet I would testify that my own experience of those called to think and decide in missionary work has been that they have been far more aware of the revolutionary situation of our world than those concerned with this country alone. Readers of Canon Max Warren's *C.M.S. News Letter* will have a ready example of what I mean. Some of the caution and conservatism of missionary societies arise not from blindness to the rapid changes of our world but from a perhaps too disabling sense that the support of vital work must not be imperilled by too complex a presentation to the Church at home.

Yet again, the missionary societies more than the Church at home have been concerned with the needs of the whole man. It is no accident that the agreed theme of the Conference of British Missionary Societies for last year was "Man and His Needs". Traditionally the ways of missionary service have been three-fold: pastoral, medical and educational, with evangelism the bond which binds all three together. The hospital was not just provided in order that the evangelist might have a captive audience, nor the school that there might be a Bible-reading Church. Even those committed to a narrower view of salvation than might recommend itself to many to-day felt the need to heal and teach, to rescue from the money-lender and the avaricious landlord, to help with the development of a more fruitful agriculture. Man's whole needs have been ever before the missionary societies.

Now these are obvious enough points, and it might even appear unnecessary to rehearse them. I do so as a preliminary to expressing an emphatic conviction that the new call to Inter-Church Aid to serve in the lands of the traditional mission fields is only to be fulfilled by the World Council of Churches and by such organs as our own British Council of Churches *with very great humility indeed.* Here we are fumbling beginners, and any good that we can do will largely be determined by the degree to which we are prepared to make this new commitment the handmaid of the missionary enterprise.

There are many dangers in this new reaching out as its leaders are

very well aware. It may be that there are large numbers in our congregations who may respond to this call more fully than to that for so long mediated by the missionary society, to which by custom or misunderstanding they have become innured. That is greatly to be desired. It will be difficult, however, to secure from such people the same depth of commitment as has characterised the supporters of the missionary societies. We may smile at the enthusiast who was as well acquainted with the appearance of the compound at Wukingfu as with his own back garden, but such interest and depth of knowledge is not to be despised.

And—to think of the receiving end—it will be very important to make sure that the receipt of such Inter-Church Aid does not distort the life of the younger Churches. Here there is manifest danger that I should sound like an antiquated dowager frightened that any one should give the poor cream cakes lest they develop an untoward passion for them. I am aware of the danger but the fact remains. Every missionary society has been aware of that risk for long enough. Readers of the little booklet by the last English Presbyterian missionary to leave China, Margaret Kiesow, entitled *China—the Challenge* (Presbyterian Book Room, 134 George Street, W.1, 1s. 6d.)* will readily recognise what I mean. It is all too possible to build up too big a reliance upon Western funds, so that if such support is cut off the Church is bereft and bewildered. Quite apart from the possibility of such a disaster, the too ready provision of such funds may cause the Church to develop a pattern of life at variance with the economic situation of the society which it is set to evangelise, and may greatly weaken its indigenous character.

As I have said, those called to chief responsibility in these matters are fully aware of these dangers. It may be useful for us to have recollected them.

I believe that the Division of Inter-Church Aid is now planning in close association with the International Missionary Council the first "world-list" of needs which will eventually be communicated to those who may be willing to make some response. Patently the criteria for making such a list will present a very thorny problem. I understand that the approval of the National Christian Council of the area in question will be sought in every case. Where necessary, the matter will also be cleared with the appropriate Missionary Society. It may seem that the latter step borders on the very paternalism of missions which is to be avoided. It is surely clear, however, that Inter-Church Aid must never become a back-door method of gaining what a mission-

* See also CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER for October 1954.

ry society has denied not on the grounds of inability to meet it but f the inadvisability of letting the Church be so dependent.

Again, the people who make these lists will be tempted to give some riority to what are ecumenical or inter-church ventures within Africa nd Asia. That would be natural. It will nevertheless need to be atched carefully. It is possible for such projects to be admirable ut really peripheral, and in areas where the comity of missions has een a reality the very existence of a single church may provide the etter instrument for the meeting of human need which is the purpose f the venture.

Only as the lists are made can the scope of the deliberate extension of ie sphere of Inter-Church Aid be made clear. But there can be no oubt that the decision was right. It was recognised as the next stage the ecumenical journey, the inescapable conclusion to be drawn om our past actions and present fellowship, even if there is as yet o clear knowledge of how it is to be worked out. Obviously the ivision cannot and must not become a pale ecclestical reflection of .N.N.R.A. It is right to have the faith that there are untapped sources of Christian generosity which will begin to flow when hristian men are given the vision; but they could never be the vast rigating flood that the arid misery of much of Africa and Asia needs.

What the resources of the Churches acting together might provide ay be described as follows: First, they could be a more adequate emonstration of the care and compassion of Christ's people. The ivision of Studies is going to embark (equipped by Mr. Rockefeller's lendid benefaction) on a major study of the common Christian sponsibility for areas of rapid social change. This is a first-class roject and one greatly needed, but the entry of Inter-Church Aid multaneously into those very areas will plainly show that the World ouncil is not content merely to count the patient's pulse and record is temperature. Secondly, these resources may sufficiently strengthen ie younger Churches to make them more effective "pilot projects" of responsible society, showing more clearly their concern with the mmunity about them and the legitimate aspirations of this generation. hirdly, this giving may have the same kind of effect as those resources hich the Churches have made available for refugees; in comparison ith the need the gift may almost seem infinitesimal, but the willingness the Churches to give all they can will help to keep (or make) the ider community sensitive to the human needs of Asia and Africa.

Frontier Chronicle

High Jinks at Bossey

The Ecumenical Institute at Bossey, near Geneva, recently held an unusual conference on the Training of the Laity. Three working groups specialized on "The Structure of the Congregation", "The Importance of Community Life", and "The Significance of Dialogue and Imagination".

The first group was reasonably orthodox, and was conducted firmly and efficiently through a refreshing critical examination of the problems of the local parish by its chairman, Herr Klaus von Bismarck of Haus Villigst, the lay training centre in the Ruhr. Group two was led by Brother Yan, a Dutch psychologist from the Protestant "monastery" at Taizé, France. Once again there was clear evidence of a real hunger among lay people for some live centre of spiritual guidance which they can use as a base, and to which they can return for quiet and for stimulation when they are battered by living "on the frontier". The third group, led by Dr. Kist of the lay college at Oud Poelgeest, Holland, embarked on an extraordinary programme of socio-drama, social mime and similar dramatic experiments, which bewildered and delighted the rest of the conference. It was all very stimulating not only for the fun of seeing Anglican canons and continental Academy directors composing and acting something like spiritual charades, but for the unusual emphasis on the value of ritual and drama in the life of the Church.

The consultation ended with a short—much too short—retreat and silence. An excellent idea, which should perhaps have been undertaken more thoroughly and systematically. Here the Ecumenical Movement can surely learn something in technique both from our Roman and Anglo-Catholic friends and from the Quakers?

W.C.C. and Under-developed Areas

The World Council of Churches has made three interesting new appointments for its study on *Christian Responsibility in Areas of Rapid Social Change* which is financed with a grant of 100,000 dollars from John D. Rockefeller, Jun. The Rev. Daisuke Kitagawa, a Japanese who has lived in America since 1940 and is a priest of the Protestant Episcopal Church, has been appointed special assistant for the study. Mr. M. M. Thomas, an Indian graduate from Madras University, past youth secretary for the Mar Thoma Church and a World Student Christian Federation secretary, is to be staff consultant for the study in Asia. And for a similar position for the study in Africa south of the Sahara the Council has appointed Dr. John Karefa-Smart. A medical doctor, who is also an ordained minister, he was born in Sierra Leone, has studied in Durham, Ohio and Montreal, has been a lecturer in medicine at the University of Nigeria, and was until recently West African area officer for the World Health Organization.

Apartheid—I

A Bill recently introduced in the South African Parliament amends the Bantu Education Act so as to abolish any inquiry before the Minister of Native Affairs decides whether or not to register and therefore legalize a school. Dr. Verwoerd has already said that virtually no new private schools will be permitted, and that direct fee-paying by native parents towards the education of their children will not be allowed.

Apartheid—II

It is reported from South Africa that the Government is expected soon to enforce apartheid in South African universities, to establish a new university for natives, and to move Bantu university education from the control of the Minister of Education and to place it in the hands of the Minister of Native Affairs, Dr. Verwoerd.

Forty-six Million Dollarsworth

The World Council of Churches Division of Inter-Church Aid report that inter-church aid gifts for the year 1955 amount to about 46,000,000 dollars, a great increase from the 30,000,000 dollars of 1950.

A great deal of this increase has been due to the enormous supply of United States surplus food, and the generous giving of the American churches. Relief has gone not only to the European refugees, but to practically every global emergency such as the Indian and Pakistan floods, and the Greek and Philippine earthquakes.

The Next Kirchentag

Plans for the Kirchentag at Frankfurt/Main next August are being completed with truly German efficiency. It is now expected that the number of participants in the whole congress will be something like 50,000, and that some 20,000 more will attend the final session on the Sunday afternoon. The youth camps alone will add some 30,000 to the total. It is pleasant to learn that once again Roman Catholic authorities and households are co-operating in the search for accommodation for all these visitors.

There have been strenuous attempts made to develop the ecumenical side of this year's Kirchentag. There will be a special Ecumenical Centre, bilingual guides and translation facilities, Bible studies in English and a number of ecumenical services. A large number of Americans are expected, and a lively Scottish contingent. It is disappointing that the number of enrolments from England remains (so far) at a very low figure. We may rightly be suspicious of mass meetings and mass movements; but a Kirchentag is an experience not to be missed. M. G.

Sociologists and Marriage

The Report of the Royal Commission on Marriage and Divorce came under severe but illuminating criticism at a meeting of the British Sociological Society on 25th April. The speaker, Mr. O. R. Macaulay, Lecturer in Social Studies at Bedford College, described its findings bluntly as "intellectually undistinguished and obscurantist", its worst offence being, apparently, that it endeavoured to uphold the Christian law of marriage. His address was mainly devoted to a brilliant survey of the history of the Divorce laws, which embodied incontrovertible truths often overlooked by the Christian apologist. The 1857 Act, he pointed out, introduced no new principle into the law of the Church of England as then understood. During the past 150 years it had been possible for the wealthy and influential to remarry after securing the permission of Parliament in a special Act; over 200 persons had done so and no Bishop had been known to raise his voice in objection. (No reference was made to the Victorian Ecclesiastical Courts, whose notorious incompetence, partiality and costliness, did much to precipitate the demand for reform.)

The effect of the new Act was to make the Courts accessible to a wider circle, but it still left the great mass of the people without any form of matrimonial relief and it gave legal endorsement to a double standard of morality and to gross injustice to women. Domestic conditions among the working classes were then incredible; cases of brutal assaults on wives who had no form of redress whatever were numbered in thousands. After a now-forgotten campaign led by Miss Frances Power Cobbe, the right of separation with maintenance under summary jurisdiction was secured and the nation settled down to two entirely different systems of matrimonial relief for rich and poor.

The first real break with tradition was made when the Herbert Act of 1937 extended the grounds of divorce in ways unnecessary to describe, but not until the needs of the ex-serviceman became clamant in the early 'forties were the Divorce Courts really opened to the poor, and the full extent of the demand for the dissolution of unhappy marriage became known. It had, Mr. Osborne suggested, been there all the time but hidden by the disabilities attached to poverty. He regretted that the proposals for "divorce by consent", and the dissolution of marriage at the will of one party, where the union had in fact broken down, were not recommended by the Royal Commission. They would not, he considered, increase the numbers of divorce cases coming before the Courts, but they would relieve the parties from the existing necessity of having to commit, or pretending to commit a matrimonial offence in order to secure freedom from an intolerable bond. The Royal Commission had also erred by accepting too readily a gloomy view of the social effects of divorce. An increase in divorce had been accompanied by an increase in marriage. In a large number of cases there were no children of the unions dissolved, or the children had grown up; even where there were young children, the evidence that they were adversely effected was inadequate. The lecturer regarded reconciliation by the Courts with considerable suspicion. Like many others in an even better position to judge, he held that it was then too late to make the attempt, and added that it would be deplorable if pressure were exercised to enforce standards of Christian marriage on litigants who had no obligation or desire to accept them.

These comments inevitably suggested

listeners accustomed to the Christian proach that although it is manifestly ot for sociology to determine ideals of ehaviour, or to regulate basic institu-ons, sociology can perform an ex-emely useful function in showing here and how institutions are failing, d why ideals are being rejected by a mmunity.

Dr. Johnson once pointed out that endships must be kept in repair or ey disintegrate and vanish; that is rtainly true of the institution of arriage. If it is allowed to become the eeding ground of injustices, tyrannies d cruelties, for which no effective dress is provided, a population will ack the institution itself.

It should be clear now that from the ristian standpoint it was a mistake to try and protect the stability of marriage by denying to the poor reliefs accepted by the Church as permissible to the rich, and by leaving an aggrieved wife practically helpless. It was also a mistake, and one perhaps still being committed, to ignore the extent to which the doctrine of the indissolubility of marriage calls for a consistently high standard of Christian behaviour within the family. If the Churches had been as concerned to condemn domestic bullying, or neglect of children, as they have been to condemn divorce, the esteem in which Christian marriage is held would be very different to-day and we would not be asked to attend so many conferences on the decay of family life.

LETITIA FAIRFIELD.

Libraries for Refugees

The organization known as *Aid to splaced Persons* has recently developed very useful new service for refugees in ropean camps. They have been able organize a whole series of small raries in Austria, Italy and Germany, d find that these are extremely well ed, as many displaced people with intellectual interests cannot afford to buy reading material for themselves. Books are wanted in most European languages other than English, and something like 1400 volumes have already been dispatched. Details may be obtained from Aid to Displaced Persons, 53 Draycott Place, London, S.W.3. M. G.

The foot of the page quotations in this issue of the CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER *are m "Christian Belief and this World" by A. R. Vidler (S.C.M., 12s. 6d.), a book ich we recommend our readers to obtain.*

'The Bible, if you take it as a whole, leaves us in no doubt that God is interested he welfare of nations and states as well as of the church; He is interested in legis-on as well as in love, in hygiene as well as in holiness, in work as well as in worship, rt as well as in devotion, and it is to be presumed that where God is interested, ristians should be so, too. It would be astonishing if it were not so, since the sibility of preaching the gospel and building up the church depends on the main-nance of order and freedom by civil governments. 'He who expects a flourishing urch in a fading Commonwealth', said Thomas Fuller, 'let him try whether one of his face can smile when the other is pinched'" (p. 45).

Do We Like the Death Penalty?

SIR WALTER MOBERLY

Reflections on Hanging. Arthur Koestler. (Gollancz. 12s. 6d.)

Capital Punishment as a Deterrent and the Alternative. Gerald Gardin (Gollancz. 6s.)

A Life for a Life. Sir Ernest Gowers. (Chatto and Windus. 7s. 6

These three books have a common theme which is immediate topical. A Bill for the abolition of the death penalty has been befo Parliament; but it is public opinion which will decide the issue and all have a duty to inform ourselves. As recently as 1948 a sm majority in the House of Commons voted in favour of suspensi during a five years experimental period. But the House of Lords, af four days debate, rejected the proposal by a very large majori (One hundred and eighty-one to twenty-eight.) Law Lord after La Lord, Elder Statesman after Elder Statesman, laid it down that t death penalty provides an indispensable check on murderous impu and that its removal would inevitably lead to some additional murde

In the same debate the question was put in a Christian setting by t present Archbishop of Canterbury. The Church, he said, recogniz the right of civil society to take life in extremity of self-defence. B "within the Church itself always, and in the world *so far as practicable*, the law of love with its power to forgive, to convert, reform and to refashion must permeate and shape the application the law of punishment". Here the operative words are those which have italicized. How far is it practicable at any given moment dispense with the death penalty as a deterrent? On this question, sa the Archbishop, each individual Christian must make up his mi "according to his own judgment, discrimination and experience". the exercise of that personal judgment our leaders differed from o another. The Bishop of Chichester, Dr. Bell, argued strongly f abolition, as William Temple had done nearly twenty years befo But Dr. Fisher himself together with Dr. Mervyn Haigh and D Hunkin agreed with the majority in supporting retention, thou Dr. Fisher would have limited its operation even further than present.

To-day the situation has changed. A Royal Commission has held exhaustive inquiry, of which full use is made in these three book All of them are well informed, all are readable, all in my judgment a

gently argued, and all are abolitionist. They vary in tone, Mr. oestler writing with militant fervour, Mr. Gardiner with relentless gic and Sir Ernest Gowers with judicial restraint. But substantially ey present the same case.

Mr. Koestler approaches British institutions in the first instance, ith the eyes of an outside observer. He does not share our attachment precedent and our deference to the Bench of Judges. He reminds us at our neighbours admire the judicial fairness of our trials, but raise eir eyebrows at the barbarity of some of our punishments. He mself spent three months during the Civil War in Spain under ntence of death as a suspected spy, "witnessing the execution of my llow prisoners and expecting my own". He meant to write in a cool d detached manner, but "indignation and pity came seeping in".

Mr. Gardiner's objective is the most limited but it is the most mistakably attained. He examines with exemplary clarity two of e main arguments advanced for retention; that capital punishment is unique and indispensable deterrent and that no satisfactory alternative n be devised. He submits these to analysis and criticism which is cid, sober and devastating.

Sir Ernest Gowers was chairman of the Royal Commission and his is ssibly the most significant contribution of all. He gives a careful rvey of current opinion, as expressed in evidence to the Commission in the House of Lords, and he examines coolly the chief arguments ed on either side. But, for all its reticence, his book contains the ory of a conversion. He first approached the work of the Royal ommission with the impression that capital punishment is required r deterrence and that "the hearts of abolitionists are larger than their ads". But "four years of close study gradually dispelled that feeling" d have led him to the contrary conclusion.

In public discussion the case for retention has rested on the belief at the death penalty is a deterrent of unique force; and this belief elf has been based mainly on common-sense: "I know it would be a eat deterrent to me," "One can hardly doubt". In the House of rds, any arguments to the contrary were brushed aside as obviously radoxical. But whatever justification this attitude may have had in 48, it is untenable to-day. In the light of the Royal Commission's vestigations, the alleged indispensability of the death penalty has to made good and can no longer be assumed. The widespread popular pression that it is beyond doubt rests on sheer ignorance of relevant cts.

(1) Most murders are not calculated. The great majority are committed persons in a state of violent passion or of obviously abnormal mentality, a neither type looks far ahead. It is only the small class of "orthod professional criminals", i.e. not even the "gangster" but the burglar, whi expert witnesses now believe is prevented only by the death penalty from carryi arms and using them to resist arrest.

(2) To-day only one in twelve of those who commit murder is eventua hanged. Even of those caught, convicted, and not found insane, about fi per cent were reprieved during the period 1929 to 1948. The prospect of insta and certain death may be strongly deterrent; but all experience goes to sh that the most drastic severity is an ineffective weapon wherever the chance escaping it is substantial.

(3) Even for the small class of professional criminals, the available evider strongly suggests that the death penalty is *not* a unique and indispensa deterrent to murder. Otherwise why was the abolition of capital punishment England for other offences not followed by any increase in their numbe As Mr. Gardiner points out, exactly the same warnings, in exactly the sa terms, by exactly the same type of mind and with exactly the same presumpti of authority as to-day, were then refuted by the event. Again why has t widespread abolition of the death penalty for murder in other countries be followed nowhere by any perceptible increase in the murder rate, and w has its occasional reinstatement been followed by no diminution? Why a the only European countries, on this side of the Iron Curtain, in whi professional criminals normally carry arms, France and Spain, the only t which have not abolished capital punishment?

Much of this evidence was available in 1948. Why then did t Peers, including the Archbishop, sweep aside the statistical argumen as "utterly unreliable", and appeal from "such meagre data" to "t judgment and common-sense of every individual" or to "the eviden of my own feeling"? It was because the natural inference from t figures seemed incredible. No reasoned refutation was given but only excuse for ignoring them. To-day such an excuse is no longer admissibl It is one thing to refuse to take such an argument at its face value a to demand further examination. It is quite another thing simply sweep it aside because it conflicts with our prepossessions and to lea it at that. If it is suggested that murderers differ from other types criminals, or British from foreign murderers, we must further ask whi of these differences are relevant to the argument and whether th weaken or strengthen it.

It is hard to conceive any further inquiry more comprehensive a searching than that which the Royal Commission has now carried ou and it affords no support at all to the belief that the death penalty is significant deterrent to murder to-day. There comes a point at whi resistance to cumulative evidence amounts to wilful perversity.

any of us, or of our leaders, still maintain that the death penalty is indispensable, we must do so on stronger ground than in 1948. The massive argument contained in these books must be refuted in detail; it can no longer be by-passed.

Even if the deterrent argument were made out, it would not be conclusive. We have abolished public executions as well as their gruesome accompaniments, and we steadily decline even to consider such methods as punishing a criminal's innocent family or friends. This is not because it is proved that no possible murderers have been deterred by such means. It is because we regard these methods as so inherently evil, soiling those who inflict them and debasing those who witness or picture them, that we will not tolerate their employment whatever the consequences.

But the argument is *not* made out and the available evidence, as distinct from expressions of opinion, tends in the opposite direction. Unfortunately "evidence that is unsatisfying to the emotions is sometimes treated more airily than one might think it deserved to be".

In truth, the public debates have been unsatisfying because neither side really regards direct deterrence as a sufficient criterion. To both the death penalty is a symbol. The one side regards murder as a uniquely noxious and shocking crime, which should be marked by a unique penalty, in order to "build up in the community over a long period of time a deep feeling of peculiar abhorrence for the crime of murder". Abolition is opposed lest it should weaken this abhorrence. The other side emphasizes the staggering violence of the paradox involved in teaching respect for life by privately breaking the neck of a lawless taker of life, and it regards the excitement of sordid impulses as an inevitable consequence. Why did men formerly flock to public executions? Why do they now read avidly those newspapers which specialize in horrors? Why are there, on the average, five applications every week for the post of Public Executioner, from people who seek to "earn a little pocket money by taking part in the grim, ritual killing of a fellow creature"? (Royal Commission). If we agree with the Royal Commission that the ultimate test of the death penalty must be "its diffused influence on the moral consciousness of society", there is a heavy debit to be brought into the reckoning.

Here strict demonstration is impossible. As Sir Ernest Gowers points out, we have a collision of contrary pre-suppositions, each really resting on faith. In practice the crucial question is, "On which side lies the burden of proof?" The defender of capital punishment should ask himself, "Do I hate the death penalty and only retain it

reluctantly because convinced that it cannot be abandoned without multiplying murder? Or do I really feel some murders to be so horrible that I want the murderer to die and should be outraged if he were allowed to remain alive?" This is the note on which Sir Ernest Gowers concludes. "When a people no longer likes the death penalty for murderers, it will be removed, no matter what may happen to the homicide rate." Do we, and should we "like" it? That is the basic question.

Politics Ought to be Dull

T. E. UTLEY

(The substance of a talk given at the Frontier Luncheon on 7th June 1956, when Mr. Henry Brooke, Financial Secretary to the Treasury was in the chair.)

In this talk I want to contrast what I think are the two main alternative approaches to politics. And I want to suggest that there is from time to time a tendency among Christians who engage in political thinking to be too much under the influence of one of those traditions of political thought.

There is in the first place an approach to politics which starts with the idea that people's political views and the political action which they are going to take arising from those views are the result, so to speak, of cogitation in the abstract before politics begins; a tradition which assumes that we sit down, or that we ought to sit down, and think of what we mean by the good society, to map out a constitution of universal social justice with clear principles, and then go into politics and try to apply these principles. Of course we shall not assume that all these principles will be carried into effect; the world is not perfect and therefore we cannot impose a perfect society upon it, but we shall get as near as possible. We shall from time to time make concessions to folly and sin, but all the time we shall have this belief in social perfection before our eyes and all the time we shall address ourselves to trying to impose as much of this pattern as we can on society. And of course this approach to politics appeals to a great many very edifying instincts, and indeed to some fundamentally religious feelings. It appeals to people's passion for justice, it appeals to people's desire for some permanent resting-place. The idea that you are going to build the New Jerusalem and that one day it will be built and you will have got there is extremely attractive. It appeals to the ever-present

human desire for harmony, the idea that you are going to create a universal society in which there will be no tensions, a society which will be clearly inspired by one spirit. And it also evokes from those who adopt this approach to politics a great deal of zeal; it is an extremely exhilarating sensation to feel that you are taking part in a political movement which has as its aim the creation of a just society.

Now it is my contention that, noble as are the instincts from which this approach to politics proceeds, it is in fact an extremely dangerous one. And I think that our Christian persuasion ought to incline us to the opposite approach, I mean the approach which starts from the assumption that politics is a natural and inevitable activity. Here we are in society, and by the very fact of our presence in society we are constantly exercising power over other people. It is one of our inevitable natural functions. There is no need for a defence of the existence of politics; there is no need for profound cogitation on the subject of what politics is for. Politics is there. We are in the middle of society which is part of the order of creation, and we have to do something about it. We find ourselves confronted with a mass of opposing wills and opposing traditions and social tensions and an infinite variety of human personalities, each of which we are resolved to try to respect. And somehow or other as politicians—if we feel called to this particular exercise—we have to reconcile or achieve some reconciliation between these tensions. Politics on this view is simply the art of managing the inevitable tensions and complexities of society in such a way that we shall produce the greatest possible degree of human contentment; in such a way that we shall provide for our safety and the safety of our allies against attack; in such a way that we shall provide for the subsistence of our people. Politics is a present and inevitable thing; it has to work on data which already exist, which we can do little about modifying. It is a question of coping with situations.

I believe that this is the right attitude towards politics and is an attitude towards which Christianity must particularly predispose us. However, it does not at all exclude the idea that there are ultimate and universal principles. Of course there are ultimate and universal principles. It is in a sense a hopeful thing that when people violate these principles they take the trouble to assert them at the same time. It is so with the operation of justice behind the Iron Curtain. Every time that the principle of the rule of law is broken, an elaborate hypocrisy is produced to give the impression that this principle is being observed and asserted. It is still possible to believe, as our ancestors

did, and all those who hold the doctrine of fundamental law believe that there are writ in the hearts of men certain ultimate fundamental principles, principles such as the principle that people should be treated alike in proportion as they are alike, and things of that sort. My only contention is that these principles, which are moral principles and pre-political principles, are in their very nature of so abstract a kind that we have said very little about politics when we say we propose to observe them. The great majority of our contemporary political conflicts are conflicts over the interpretation which these principles should have in some particular situation and the means which should be used to carry them into effect.

I am not saying that principles and belief in fundamental law are wrong. I am simply saying that when we come in a Christian society to consider what divides us, it is not, thank God, all these things it is subsidiary matters of interpretation and so forth which provide and ought to provide the substance of political discussion. So I would emphasize that I am not assailing the whole tradition of Christian political thought which rests upon this notion of fundamental law. All I am saying is that in any society at any moment you have lots of logically insoluble tensions with which you have to operate. This is the very starting point of thinking about politics, this notion of a society with incompatible wishes and incompatible views, none of which necessarily violate the broad abstract principles common to everybody but which nevertheless make it extremely difficult to govern.

Now it would seem to me that it is particularly apparent that in Britain since 1945 we have been living in a community which is distinguished by the incompatibility of its wishes and views. Not only have different people wanted opposite things, but also the same people have wanted incompatible things without realizing that they were incompatible. There are, of course, the stock illustrations of this for example the desire on the one hand to get whatever wages you want and on the other to keep prices down. This is the central problem of British politics at the moment. And it seems to me there are two ways of looking at this problem. Recently one of these ways was very brilliantly expressed by a writer who is widely suspected of being Mr. Graham Hutton, in *The Times Literary Supplement*. According to his contention, what we are trying to do is to operate a mixed economy and a mixed economy is impossible. There are two things to which men respond, the desire for gain and the fear of being made the object of public force. You cannot dispense with both of these. You must either have a free economy in which people will move to the right

obs because it pays them to do so, or a compelled economy in which eople are forcibly moved into the right jobs and are obliged to save y confiscation by the State. And this is a very attractive argument hich was extremely ably developed.

Now my contention is that, attractive as this argument is, it is an llustration of how one ought not to think about politics, because both he remedies proposed are politically impracticable. The first remedy —of an absolutely *laisser faire* economy—would probably be nipped n the bud by a general strike; the second remedy would split the Labour arty from top to bottom and might lead to something even worse nan a general strike if it were adopted. The assumption which is nade in this article and in all this sort of political thinking, is that e are dealing with individuals in the abstract about whom accurate eneral statements can be made as to what makes them do things. ut in point of fact we are dealing with individuals in the concrete who re subject to a great variety of impulses pulling in one way or another. o try to produce solutions which are based on an abstract idea of the ncentives to which human nature responds is disastrously unrealistic. , however, we ally political thinking with a concrete situation we rst of all see that these two extremes, which are said to be alternatives economics, are impossible in politics, and precisely because they re politically impossible they are also economically impossible. hen we have to reconcile ourselves—and every government in turn as to reconcile itself—to managing a society which is distinguished these incompatible wishes and to which these logical choices of olicy do not apply. And how do we do it? We do it by a mixed olicy; partly by the manipulations which our chairman and his lleagues employ from time to time to stop people borrowing money nd to bring the financial situation slightly more in contact with reality. ut you do not depend wholly on these methods; at the same time you peal for restraint on the part of the trade unions, and disappointing the results may seem, the extent to which they have succeeded over e last ten years is in fact amazing. And you wait and hope for some rn of events or for some fundamental change in public opinion brought out by a more long-term process of education to create an atmosphere which government becomes easier. But the condition of governing country in that kind of a situation is to adopt the approach to politics nich starts from accepting the situation of the country as it is, and e incompatible wishes of the community as they are, and trying to ake the most of them.

Now the result of that will almost inevitably be dull; the result of

that will be to produce the sort of politics which is now contemptuously termed Butskellism. It is not the sort of politics which it is easy for political commentators, judging from fundamental abstract standpoints of conduct, to enjoy. It is not the sort of thing which is going to please *Punch*. But that is not the object of politics, which does not exist to subserve the cause of writing. The assumption that politics does exist for that reason plays a much larger part in the thinking of individuals than most people realize—and it is a particularly dangerous assumption.

Politics managed in this way will be dull. But I will be told in conclusion two things, I think; firstly, that this attitude could not commend itself to anybody who belonged to the Radical persuasion, and that what I am doing is commending a Conservative view of politics under cover of Christianity. That I would resist, because I think that the most distinctive feature of British Radicalism, and certainly its most valuable feature, is its essential opportunism. It is something which springs out of circumstances. The Radical has to believe for the sake of his views that he is maintaining a constant tradition. He has to believe that when he is advocating Nationalisation in the twentieth century he is really doing the same as Cobden was doing in the 1850's when he was advocating Free Trade. But in point of fact the spirit of British Radicalism assumes a totally different incarnation, and the really great Radicals like Mr. Aneurin Bevan are distinguished for their opportunism, in no offensive meaning of the word. In so far as they have a valuable contribution to make it arises from the fact that they regard it as their function to make trouble within reason; to find unexpressed grievances and to express them; but to be willing to settle for half the price. If this statement of British Radicalism is true, it proves British Radicalism to be within the broad framework, the empirical tradition, which I have tried to indicate.

And I may be told that this is a statement about political views and not about the difference which Christianity should make to the discussion of politics in society. But it does appear to me that there are some assumptions behind this attitude towards politics which are very specifically Christian: the assumption that you don't really find the resting-place of human endeavours in this world; the assumption that you cannot really separate the principle from the circumstances in which it is applied; that in all its aspects the redemptive function of the Church is being carried on in particular historical concrete situations; that we are concerned not simply with the Word but with the Word become flesh; and it appears to me that there is a connexion between

he historical setting of Christianity and this approach to politics. And I think it also teaches the Christian to regard politics as something which he is delivering into the hands of Providence and which will e made use of in ways which he cannot foresee. The great Lord alisbury was asked if he was not terribly worried about the consequences hen writing a memorandum upon which peace and war might depend. Ie replied: "The consequences? What on earth have they to do with ie?"

Whither South Africa?

A new voice in D.R.C. Theology

E. H. Robertson

For those who oppose the racial segregation of South Africa, the utch Reformed Church in the Union has assumed a role like that of e "German Christians" in Nazi Germany. Dr. Malan himself was a inister of the D.R.C. and Dr. Strijdom confidently asked for its ayers on his behalf as he pushed forward with the Bantu Education ct. At every turn, the D.R.C. could be trusted to support Apartheid id to justify astonishing actions with Biblical arguments. Now, one its stars has fallen. Professor B. B. Keet, of Stellenbosch University, e elder statesman of Dutch Reformed theologians, who expressed me anxiety last year at the Pretoria Conference, has published a ok which leaves little of Strijdom's "Apartheid" remaining. It is the eatest blow his policy has suffered. The only answer open to his ponents is to say that Professor Keet is getting old and has not fully preciated the temper of modern scholarship. The theologians of the nion are now busy at work trying to prove their teacher wrong. They ve an embarrassing task; but they have to do it, because Professor B. Keet cannot be ignored.

Father Huddleston may say the same things but he will not be ened to in the same way. The importance of Professor Keet's book hat it comes out of the heart of Calvinist South Africa. He speaks language that Pretoria understands. The book, *Whither South rica: A contribution to the discussion of our race problem**, is addressed, Professor Keet says in his Foreword, "to my Afrikaans-speaking

id Afrika Warkeen?

fellow South Africans". The fact that it is written in Afrikaans emphasizes this; but he is right to say that "this does not mean that what I have written has no application to English-speaking South Africans". Apartheid is usually accepted in one form or another by English-speaking as well as Afrikaans-speaking South Africans. There is no effective opposition to it in the Union of South Africa, except by men like Father Huddleston and outstanding minorities. The battle for the Union of South Africa and the saving of its soul is not a straight fight between Afrikaans and English-speaking people. Professor Keet now confirms this by giving us the most powerful attack on Apartheid, in Afrikaans.

It is a small book of seven chapters, a theological work addressed to church people and dealing seriously with the Biblical supports for Apartheid. These consist largely of reiterating the warnings to Israel that she must be a separated people, not mixing with the surrounding nations of Canaan. Professor Keet has no difficulty in dealing with these feeble comparisons. The first chapter is, "Where did our colour prejudice come from?" It is headed with the text: "Who hath sinned, this man or his parents, that he was born blind?" and the answer of Jesus is given: "Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents, but that the works of God might be made manifest in him". (John 9, vv. 2, 3.) Professor Keet then goes on to analyse why South Africa is where she is in this matter of racial prejudice. He maintains that "to understand any phenomenon, especially in the field of human responsibility, it is necessary to trace it back to its origins and watch its growth". The first chapter is such an attempt and it shows how recent this present situation is. It has arisen out of fear and its growth can be compared with the decline of white power throughout the world. As an example of how recently relations between black and white have worsened, he contrasts university habits a generation ago with those to-day. "We can remember, not so very long ago", he writes, "how at a place such as Stellenbosch, large gatherings of students would eagerly listen to addresses by Christian negroes like Dr. Aggrey and Max Yergan or even to non-Christians, like Dr. Abdurahman." That is no longer possible without a scandal. What has happened?

In a recent broadcast, Professor Keet expanded this part of his book tracing the change of relations between black and white in church life. He said:

> "Before the middle of the nineteenth century the Dutch Reformed Church made no distinction between black and white as far as its membership was concerned. In 1857, however, as a result of difficulties which arose in several

congregations of mixed membership the Synod decided that separate organisation of coloured and European congregations would be tolerated owing to the weakness of some who found it difficult to attend the same services and sit at the same communion table as the coloured people. The lack of any scriptural grounds for this separation was acknowledged, but rather than having to meet the many practical difficulties this concession was made. Many years later, in 1881, the Coloured Mission Church was established, a church with the same language, creed, ecclesiastical polity and liturgy as those of the European Church but organized in separate congregations, presbyteries and Synod, and enjoying virtual independence although it was and still is dependent on the Mother Church spiritually and financially. The development of this Church has admittedly been very striking and at the present time the measure of its influence among the coloured constituency which it serves can bear comparison with that of the European Church among its own people. Supporters of apartheid in the church point with pride to the excellent results that have accrued from the separation that took place so many years ago. They contend, with some reason, that the coloured Christians would never have developed such a sense of self-reliance and responsibility, had they not been allowed to have their own church; along those lines only could they be thrown on their own resources, develop leadership and enjoy free growth."

There are many ways of approaching the problems raised by partheid. Professor Keet seeks to deal with the problem of racial rejudice as a Christian and, because he is a Reformed Christian, his rst question is: "What does the Bible say, what is the judgment of hrist, about principles governing the problems of race and nation?".

His answer takes up the second chapter of his book, headed with a uotation from St. Paul: "God hath made of one blood all nations of en for to dwell on the face of the earth". He deals with the six main guments for Apartheid, as they have been gleaned from the Scriptures Dr. M. W. Retief, a well-known broadcaster of religious talks in outh Africa. Professor Keet denies that God willed Apartheid. He is epared to concede that God intended races to be different, but not at he intended them to be separated. This is an important distinction. ne Bible knows only one kind of separation—separation from sin. ne much vaunted texts from the Old Testament are shown to be pport for an Apartheid of Israel and the pagan nations, i.e. between w and Gentile. Such an Apartheid has been done away in Christ. r "in Christ" there is neither Jew nor Greek; he has broken down the rrier. The point is fully developed in Keet's third chapter on "Church partheid", which has at its head the quotation from the Apostles' eed: "I believe in the holy, catholic Church, the Communion of ints". The Church must be one in fellowship. Apartheid is a sinful empt to divide the Church and to destroy its fellowship.

The second support given to Apartheid by Dr. Retief is that God had called and separated Europeans in Africa, as he had separated Israel in the ancient world. He called the Dutch pioneers to blaze the trail of truth and civilization through the darkness of African barbarism. To do this effectively, they had to keep their own customs and principles or they would be submerged in the surrounding darkness. There is obviously much truth in this, but the identification with Israel is dangerous. Professor Keet points out that this was a social problem and not a religious one. Dutchmen did not have to separate themselves from French and Germans in order to fulfil their divine destiny in Europe. Separation of this kind, to preserve one's identity has no permanent character. "The simple truth", says Professor Keet, "is that neither race nor colour are to be preserved at all cost, but only so long as there is a danger of mixing Christianity with paganism, or civilization with barbarism".

In like manner he disposes of Dr. Retief's other arguments. In particular, he deals a blow at those who talk of the European's divine mission in Africa. The Church knows only one mission, in Africa as elsewhere, to win men for Christ. At certain stages of development it may be necessary to keep ourselves "unspotted from the world", "separated", in order to preserve the witness; but no evangelism can long be effective if this "separateness" is built up into a principle of superiority.

Having disposed of arguments for Apartheid, Professor Keet brings the full battery of Biblical texts to denounce it. Without the present situation in South Africa, it would be impossible for anyone to derive the pernicious doctrine of separation from the Scriptures. Properly read, the Bible denounces Apartheid in round terms. On Mars Hill, speaking as a Jew to Greeks, St. Paul explains that he has felt the religious nature of the city. He comes to declare the unknown God, made known in Jesus Christ. He is the God of Greek as well as Jew. "And hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth". In the letter to Timothy, "God was manifest in the flesh, justified in the spirit, seen of angels, preached unto the Gentiles, believed on in the world, received up into glory". No text, however, so effectively destroys Apartheid among Christians as the verses in St. Paul's letter to the Galatians. Against these verses there is no answer: "For as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. There is neither Jew nor Greek, there is neither bond nor free, there is neither male nor female: for all are one in

hrist Jesus". The spirit of that verse broke slavery in Jamaica; it ay yet break Apartheid in South Africa.

Professor Keet uses effectively the story in John 4 of the meeting of sus with the Samaritan woman. He shows that Jew and Samaritan ere as black and white in South Africa to-day. Yet Jesus drank at the nds of a Samaritan woman and talked to her informally of heavenly ings. He discussed with her the most intimate parts of her life. here is no basis for Apartheid in the New Testament and we can only d it in the Old Testament by twisting its meaning. The reason for e strong measures of separation outlined in Nehemiah is given early: "And their children spake half in the speech of Ashdod, and uld not speak in the Jew's language, but according to the language each people". That is not the situation in South Africa and it is se to act as though it were.

So Professor Keet argues. He quotes the Bible to refute the false guments from the Bible. He wishes to turn the question away from stifying to honest seeking of God's will. He believes the Bible and is stressed that it is being used instead of listened to.

The question is not: "How can we justify our way of life by the thority of the Bible? But rather: What must we do if we are to easure our lives by the standards of the Bible?" The divine destiny to evangelize, not to remain white. "Go ye therefore and teach all tions." "Our calling as preachers and evangelists does not depend on our continuance as an Afrikaans people." These are resounding rds, understood by men who value the pulpit and the Bible.

When he turns from Biblical arguments to a general view of the litical situation, Professor Keet is no less critical. He sees terrible ngers in the present efforts to divide black and white, inevitably ting them in enmity against one another. Some have argued that y Apartheid can save white civilization in Africa; Professor Keet ues that Apartheid is the surest way to destroy it. Total Apartheid mpossible and partial Apartheid is a seed bed of hatred and revolt.

The main reason for colour prejudice, he explains, is that when the opeans first came to South Africa, they found black men who e frenzied savages; and to this day they continue to equate a black n with barbarism. Professor Keet deplores this tendency. "The : is that there are to-day, among the coloured peoples of South ica, civilized persons who in no respect need stand back for the ites, and whose urge to hold what they have is as great, if not ater, than the white man's.

"It is indeed tragic to observe on all sides how colour has become the dominant factor in our judgment of human relations. A person would not be accused of exaggeration if he said that a man's worth was judged not by his inherent qualities but by the colour of his skin. That we adopt this attitude hardly needs proof; everyone who lives in South Africa is aware of it. . . .

"There exists in the non-white inhabitants of our land an insatiable hunger for knowledge and development, and the number who have emerged from barbarism and share in the privileges of western civilization become greater every day. It is a foolish illusion to believe that a limit can be placed on this development."

Professor Keet says that a perpetuation of the idea that white and non-white are equated with master and servant will have only one result, namely, to set white and non-white against one another. "Our colour prejudice is perhaps the greatest factor in producing non-white agitators and revolutionaries. Is it too much to say that the great mass of Europeans still take no notice of the changed situation? They carry on in blissful ignorance, believing that conditions are the same to-day as they were fifty years ago. And because of this race relations grow worse instead of better."

"It is always and everywhere Z's absolute duty to do his relative best—to do what is best or least bad having regard to all the circumstances that in each case have to be taken into account. When Z is convinced that a certain course of action is God's will for him, however far short of the ideal it may fall, the demand upon him is unconditional. In this sense, and in this sense only, the demands of the Christian ethic are absolute".

(*"Christian Belief and This World", p.* 111.

A Frontier Cause

The work of the British Council of Churches is being held back by lack of one or two additional members of the staff to specialize in local ecumenical activity. Money needed for this purpose has to go to pay mortgage interest on the Council's new offices (about £9,000 is still outstanding). Contributions to the special fund to pay off the debt on the Council's modest and efficient new buildings should be sent to the General Secretary: British Council of Churches, 10 Eaton Gate, London, S.W.1.

Letters to the Editor

Religious Persecution

To the EDITOR *of the* CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER.

EAR JOHN,

Your editorial remarks about persecution in Spain and Colombia (CHRISTIAN EWS-LETTER, April 1956) were much too tolerant. Why should one "respect e attitude of the stricter Romans about countenancing any other forms of hristianity"? Isn't that, in practice, to tolerate Roman intolerance? A writer *Civilta Cattolica*, a Jesuit review published from Rome, commenting on the olombian situation, has pointed out (16th October, 1954):

> "Those who hold to the true religion have the right to profess it openly, and Catholic public worship can never be rightly be considered contrary to the true well-being of a nation. On the other hand, those who hold erroneous views have no right to practise their faith in public, for what does not conform to truth and to the moral norm, has no objective right, whether to existence or propaganda or action". . . . Thus, it is wrong to stigmatize as 'persecution' certain legitimate restrictions, as Catholic public worship alone has absolute freedom, in accordance with the facts of the situation, as recognized by the Constitution, ratified by the Concordat, and interpreted by other agreements —while the freedom of other persuasions is restricted freedom, tolerance pure and simple, a freedom which may not assume any public form, nor engage in propagandist activity against the Catholic faith. . . ."
>
> (Extracts published in *Presbyterian World*, June 1955, p. 87.)

This view of religious freedom is a mockery of freedom. The "wide discretion" ich Rome wisely gives to the local hierarchy everywhere (your Editorial) appears be accompanied by a statement of principles which can only lead to intolerance d the kind of persecution occurring in Colombia and Spain, when a Roman jority allied to a reactionary government holds the power.

There are, indeed, "enlightened Roman Catholics who do not condone the secution of Protestants". These I respect, but more of them should be raising blic protest. When B. and K. visited us, Romans were quick to lead and support tions of protest against the persecution of Christians which has occurred in mmunist-dominated countries. Have they protested yet against the persecution the Colombian hierarchy and Government which, since 1948, has led to the sing and destruction of numerous Protestant churches, damage to Protestant nes and imprisonment of Protestant laymen and pastors? And has any thoritative voice among them yet refuted the statement of principles from ich I quote above? I should like to know!

Your Reformed Catholic and in this matter very angrily

Protestant friend,

EDNA ROE.

ondon, S.W.

The Civil Service

To the EDITOR, CHRISTIAN NEWS-LETTER.

DEAR SIR,

As an ex-civil servant, I am naturally most interested in, and grateful for, the article "The Christian in the Civil Service", but the arguments put forward in support of the author's basic ideas hold together only if one can accept the assumption that governments to-day consciously see their function in God's purpose, as "to assist God's rule of the world by securing through compulsion, external compliance with His will, so that there may be maintained on earth at least a rudimentary form of the ideal society. . . ."

On first thoughts it seems obvious that the Christian civil servant "ought to be constantly looking forward to the goal which God has set, and in imitation of God's methods as disclosed in the Bible, and in history, use all possible means to bring society nearer to that goal". But is the Christian civil servant so certain of what that goal is? If so, then he is unique, for one has only to look at the differing attitude of some at least of the Dutch Reformed Church and, say, Father Trevor Huddleston as to what is God's purpose for His coloured children in South Africa, to see that Christian men may hold entirely opposing views concerning the "goal which God has set". Can one take for granted that our own Government or the Christians in our civil service are able to discern God's goal for society when faced with such problems as Cyprus, the abolition of hanging, the use of napalm bombs in Korea, the maintenance of a high standard of living in this country in the face of starvation elsewhere in the world, and so forth?

EX-CIVIL SERVANT.

The author of the article makes the following comments:

I do not think it essential to my thesis that governments should *consciously* conceive their function in God's purpose in any particular way. Of course they *ought* to have a clear idea of God's purpose for the world, but even if they don't, the Christian civil servant can at least have regard to that purpose in the advice he gives to Ministers.

I do not wish to be taken as suggesting that it is easy to know what God's good for society is. The writer of the letter has of course selected the most difficult examples, but it is time the Churches did some hard theological thinking on the subject—a matter which has been neglected for some hundreds of years.

Book Reviews

Roman Catholics and Christian Unity

Catholicism and the Ecumenical Movement. John M. Todd. (Longmans. 6s. 6d.)

All who care for the unity of the hurch should read this short book by a oman Catholic layman. Those who be- ng to the Reformed Churches will be reeably surprised to see how far a yal Roman Catholic can go to meet s "separated brethren", even at this rly state of Roman Catholic cumenism. And I suspect that oman Catholics will be still more rprised. It seems captious to iticise such an excellent book but, ke so many Roman Catholics, the thor sees the Free Churches too uch through Anglican spectacles.) he is quick to detect those atholic elements in the Free hurches which have come to them rough Anglicanism, and he is markably sympathetic to Protestant odes of worship and indeed to otestant doctrinal emphasis; but he s not yet discovered such things as the Catholic elements that are to be found, for instance, in the Presbyterian Churches quite apart from any Anglican influence. Mr. Todd's good will is universal but his sympathies are as one would expect more with the Church of England than with the Free Churches and more with the Methodists than with the other non-Episcopal Churches, which he does not distinguish very clearly. Can the word "Unitarian" on page 82 be a misprint for "Presbyterian"? Mr. Todd sees clearly enough the need for all Christians to work together on the Christian Frontier but evidently he does not think it easy to find effective ways for Roman Catholics to join in this work with other Christians. One wonders whether he is familiar with the experience of the Christian Frontier Council in this field.

J. W. L.

Facts and Figures

The Christian World Mission In Our Day. K. S. Latourette. (Eyre & Spottiswoode. 10s. 6d.)

This is a little book, but a valuable ıe, a supplement to, rather than (as e publisher suggests) a summary of, e later volumes of Professor tourette's *History of the Expan- on of Christianity*. It gives the sub- ınce of lectures given after the mpletion of the major work, and ıe can hear the accents of the cture hall and finally of the pulpit; t there is no facile popularising, d the Biblical language of the con- ıding chapter is not used to escape om the Biblical concern with facts the earlier chapters.

Facts and figures about the present position of Christians in the world, and of the growth and decline in their numbers and influences are firmly related both to social and political conditions and to the past, especially the last century with its sudden and paradoxical developments in both the spread and the repudiation of Christianity. The author is too genuinely prophetic to attempt prediction, but there are concrete and challenging recommendations for the present.

M. TELFORD.

The Doors of Destruction

Viper—the Confessions of a Drug Addict. Raymond Thorp. (Robert Hale. 12s. 6d.)

Raymond Thorp was twenty-four and had been a drug addict for six years when driven by his need for money, and perhaps also by an unconscious wish for help, he told his story to a journalist who put it into book form. Every effort was made to present it as it was heard; even to the extent of using all the slang peculiar to the community of addicts, and retaining the colloquialisms and a general indifference to grammar. At first this makes a curious impact on the reader, but one becomes accustomed to it and it achieves an effect of authenticity which a more edited version might have lacked.

Thorp described his introduction to jazz clubs in Soho, where he began to drink and where he continually met "charge" (marijuana) smokers. Within a year he was himself a "viper" which is the slang name for "charge" addicts, and later he began to peddle or "push" the drug, as the quickest way of earning enough money to supply his own increasing needs. Later he "pushed" heroin and became addicted to that drug also. He gave up his job and was completely involved in this world apart where everyone is abnormal in some way or other. His fortunes varied; for a brief period he and another man earned £100 a week, but after he had been on probation and also in prison he was avoided by other drug "pushers" as being too well known to the police. He therefore found himself unable to make money illicitly and no longer fit to take an ordinary job, so he lived on national assistance benefit in squalor

A CENTURY OF SERVICE
THE MISSIONS TO SEAMEN
1856 - 1956

THE FLYING ANGEL

Seamen often spend long periods at sea, and many months away from home. It is to these men, deprived of the blessings of a Parish Church and its Ministry that The Missions to Seamen takes the Gospel.
This great missionary work of the Church which is caring for the body, mind and soul of seafarers urgently needs your prayers and gifts.

General Superintendent: Rev. CYRIL BROWN, O.B.E., M.A.

THE MISSIONS TO SEAMEN

4 Buckingham Palace Gardens, London, S.W.1

cause everything had to be spent on drug for which he craved.

What drives a man into this position? it the impact by chance of bad mpanions, or is he impelled by some ier need which he is too weak to ist? In Raymond Thorp's case both tors are clearly at work, constantly eracting and making the outcome ore inescapable. His home was pectable, his father had a small siness, no one else in the family got o trouble. Technically it was a ood" home, but Thorp, who was the ungest child, described himself as odd man out and as a failure both at me and at school. Intelligent enough get to a grammar school, he made thing of it and left before he was teen to become a junior clerk which red him unutterably. He was solitary d unhappy, without friends, interests ambitions.

This "predisposed" him to what ntually happened. He sought the itement without which life was eless and he found it at these clubs ere for the first time he made some d of a niche for himself. He said t the effect of marijuana was to make feel big, both physically and ntally, as if he could achieve things ond human limitations.

ntry into this society is easy, but to ape is terribly hard for anyone, ecially for anyone so emotionally disposed as Thorp. Few things can rupt the total personality as quickly lrugs, and Thorp's deterioration was rapid; he lied and stole, and although sexually promiscuous he had no capacity for real affection. In the first chapter where the "editor" Derek Agnew makes some personal observations, we are told that Thorp obtained treatment which already had had partial success. Perhaps the months of telling this story to a sympathetic listener had a therapeutic effect on him, which led him to seek a cure. The difficulties of treatment are immense and it is tantalizing to have only this passing reference to it.

Derek Agnew stresses the importance of this book from the angle of arousing public opinion, and he makes some suggestions about the control of drug traffic. But this really needs expert knowledge and cannot be dealt with in a few emotionally charged paragraphs. The book has value because it arouses the imagination about the inner life of a drug addict, and because it shows how many factors contribute to the making of a drug addict, so that a cure requires treatment from every angle, physical, mental and spiritual. It is a total condition demanding total treatment, and success is unlikely if any one aspect is neglected. A physical wreck and emotionally maladjusted since childhood, such a man is unlikely to find any incentive for submitting to the demands of treatment, unless at the same time life is presented to him in a way that makes him feel that it has some purpose and that he really matters.

MARGARET TILLEY.

Challenge and Response

w Essays in Philosophical Theology. Edited by Antony Flew and Alasdair MacIntyre. Pp. xii + 274. (London, S.C.M. Press. 21s.)

is a well-known fact that at the sent time the chief intellectual llenge to the Christian Faith comes as in the last century, from the sical and biological scientists but from a widely influential group of philosophers, those who some years ago were commonly known as logical positivists but who in their present phase are more accurately described

Publication Date 3rd August, 1956

The Middle East—

BRIDGE OR BARRIER?

C. S. MILFORD

The Rev. C. S. Milford has recently toured the Middle East as an officer of the Church Missionary Society, and in this book he records impressions of his visit. In admirably concise terms he sketches some of the past and present history of the Middle East and seeks to explore the question: *Will it prove a Bridge or a barrier for the Gospel of Christ's love today?*

92 *pp.* 8 *illustrations and maps. Crown* 8*vo. Imitation Cloth Boards.* 4*s.* 6*d.*

MAN IN THE MIDST

JOHN TAYLOR

Extract from "Theology", May 1956 *issue: "Man in the Midst*, by John Taylor, is a short book (80 pages), but quite first class. Mr. Taylor knows how to write: he has a happy gift of drawing on illustrations from his experience in England and Africa; and he says what most needs to be said. It is a book that should be in parish libraries and available for lending to inquirers far and wide. And the clergy too will find that it has things to say to them. . . ."

84 *pp.* $8\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. *Bound in Linson.* 6*s.*

HIGHWAY PRESS

6 SALISBURY SQUARE, LONDON, E.C.4

logical analysts or linguistic
ıpiricists. Their most marked
ıtures are a radically empirical
proach to knowledge and a deep
spicion of metaphysics. Not indeed
at these two features need inevit-
ly go together; St. Thomas Aquinas
s radically empirical but was
vertheless a metaphysician. And
ere is indeed in the world of pro-
sional philosophy today a growing
dy of thinkers who, while they have
eived their training in the tradition
Anglo-Saxon empiricism, refuse to
hidebound by the doctrinaire nega-
ns of their immediate predecessors.
n general terms this situation is
t unfamiliar to the thinking public
a whole, but, unless one is pre-
ed to delve into the back numbers
periodicals that are not always
dily available, it is not very easy
inform oneself of the present state
the debate, the more so as the few
ks on either side which have been
tten for the general reader tend to
ıcentrate upon issues now some-
at outdated and to be characterised
a rather polemical tone. The SCM
ss is therefore to be congratulated
having assembled in the volume
w under review some of the more
portant material on the subject.
se essays demand careful and con-
ntious thought from their readers,
not technical training or expert
wledge.

t is impossible in a short space even to mention separately the twenty-two essays by sixteen different philosophers which are here gathered together. The most important are two symposia of four essays each. The former, reprinted from the periodical *Mind*, contains Professor J. N. Findlay's attempted ontological disproof of the existence of God and Mr. G. E. Hughes' penetrating refutation of the disproof; the second consists of four papers originally published in *University* on Theology and Falsification, introduced by Professor A. G. N. Flew. One of the most interesting essays is Mr. R. W. Hepburn's on Demythologising and the Problem of Validity; it might not be immediately evident why Bultmann should be brought into the present discussion, but the fact is that Bultmann's demythologising technique and his flight to existentialism, while it has little in common with logical empiricism, shares with its more genially disposed exponents an anxiety to look upon theological utterances as important together with a refusal to accept them as factual assertions. That Bultmann has drawn attention to an important problem is, I think, true. But his practice of lumping together a widely diverse set of material under the heading of "myth" and then taking refuge in existentialism seems to me to side-step the essential factual nature of the Christian affirmations.

E. L. MASCALL.

Christ alone has sown the seed that will fructify in the new creation, and in the l the whole process was in principle included; but it is God's will that the saved uld participate with the Saviour in producing, as well as harvesting, the fruits. this view, our calling in regard to the works of civilization or our opportunities bearing political responsibility are God's offer to us of an active share in that ory over the world which is Christ's alone".

("*Christian Belief and This World*", *p.* 42.)

FOUNDATIONS OF UNITY

There are still a few vacancies at the Summer Conference for lay people which is being organized by Kathleen Bliss and John Lawrence at Dunford College, Midhurst, from 8th to 15th September. The course, which is open to lay people of all Churches, is intended to help its participants to take an active part in furthering Christian unity in their own localities. Numbers will be limited to twenty.

Dunford College, the home of Richard Cobden, provides an ideal setting for a meeting of this kind. Fifteen miles from the sea, at the foot of the South Downs, Dunford College stands in its own grounds consisting of 170 acres of woodland and farm land. The house is comfortable and the cooking is good.

The course is not contemplated as a series of lectures, but as a week of study and prayer in which all will take part. There will be ample free time for informal discussion and recreation. Dr. J. H. Oldham, the Senior Fellow of Dunford College, will address the course. The Rev. Alan Booth will lead the discussion during the first half of the week.

There is a golf course at Cowdray Park three miles from Dunford, and excursions will be arranged for those who wish to take part in them.

The charge will be seven guineas for full board and lodging for seven days (registration fee 10s. 6d. extra). For further particulars write to: John Lawrence, 24 St. Leonard's Terrace, London, S.W.3.

"The kingdom of heaven has been opened to all believers. But because we ar still called to live in this world, we are still responsible for maintaining the law o God in its rudimentary, external and coercive forms, and are not yet solely concerne with its final form as proclaimed by Christ where the only compulsion it knows i the inner compulsion of love".

(*"Christian Belief and This World", p.* 44.

"But has what is wrought into the fabric of this world anything directly to d with the final fabric of the world to come? I suggest that the biblical doctrine o the resurrection of the body means that it has. There is continuity as well as dis continuity between this age and the age to come, between the old creation and th new. . . . It is this world and not any sort of world that is to be transformed a the final consummation into the world to come".

(*"Christian Belief and This World", p.* 51.